

Annamalai University Historical Series No. 21.

THE ROLE OF FEUDATORIES IN PALLAVA HISTORY

BY
M. S. GOVINDASAMY,
LECTURER IN HISTORY,
ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY.

Thesis approved for M. Litt., Degree, 1958.



Published by
THE ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY
ANNAMALAINAGAR
1965

Annamalai University Historical Series No. 21.

THE ROLE OF FEUDATORIES IN PALLAVA HISTORY

BY
M. S. GOVINDASAMY,
LECTURER IN HISTORY,
ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY.

Thesis approved for M. Litt., Degree, 1958.



Published by
THE ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY
ANNAMALAINAGAR
• 1965

Foreword

The fruitfulness of the feudatory approach to Pallava History is demonstrated by the author who discusses the problems of origin, identification, achievement and failure with judicial impartiality and succeeds in throwing a good deal of fresh light on the Pallava annals of politics and culture. The historical role of the Banas, Muttaraiyars, Kodumbalur chiefs, Cholas of Uraiyur, Palaiyarai and Renandu, Adigamans and Western Gangas is fully elucidated and a clue is provided for a better understanding of the Pallava decline. The thesis exemplifies the right method of historical investigation and the narrative is readable and free from flaws like padding. The diacritical marks have been placed with great care. In short, Sri Govindasamy's work is a fine piece of historical research, the first step in unfolding the role of feudatories in early South Indian History.

Annamalainagar, }
27-2-1965 }

R. Sathianathaier.

Preface

This thesis is the work done by me as Government of India Research Scholar in Humanities during the period 1954-56, under the supervision of Prof. R. Sathianathaier, Head of the Department of History and Politics, Annamalai University. In his well-known work, *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, Dr. J. F. Fleet rightly remarks that the history of an imperial dynasty will be incomplete without a detailed notice of at least the important feudatory families. That this remark is true also of Pallava history will be evident in the following pages. In the account given below is discussed in detail the history of the Bāṇas, Muttaraiyars, Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs, Chōḷas of Uṟaiyūr, Paḷaiyāraḷ and Rēnāṇḍu, Adigamāṇs and Western Gaṅgas with a view to ascertain their role in Pallava history. A separate chapter is devoted to individual feudatories whom one comes across in stray inscriptions. The role of feudatories in war and their exact responsibility for the decline and downfall of the Pallava power are examined as far as available evidences permit. The cultural services rendered by the feudatories particularly in fostering the Bhakti cult, architecture and sculpture are also noted. The original home of the Bāṇas, the origin of

the Muttaraiyars and the chronology of the later Pallava rulers are examined in separate notes appended respectively to Chaps. I, II, and VIII. I am grateful to Prof. R. Sathianathaier for suggesting the subject of research and guiding me throughout. I owe a deep debt of gratitude to the Vice-Chancellor Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar for the publication of my thesis under the U. G. C. scheme. I am thankful to the late Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar, the well-known Tamil scholar and historian, Mr. J. M. Somasundaram Pillai, Manager of Publications and Mr. R. Ayyaswamy Aiyar, Assistant Librarian, for their help and interest in the preparation and publication of this thesis. My thanks are also due to the Azhagu Printers Chidambaram for the neat execution of the printing of the work.

Annamalainagar, }
27—2—1965 }

M. S. Govindasamy.

CONTENTS

Foreword	i
Preface	iii
Abbreviations	vii
I. The Bāṇas	— 1
II. The Muttaraiyars	— 38
III. The Koḍumbāḷūr Chiefs	— 71
IV. The Chōḷas of Uṛaiyūr and Paḷaiyārai	— 83
V. The Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu	— 99
VI. The Adigamaṇṣ	— 112
VII. The Western Gaṅgas	— 125
VIII. Individual feudatories	— 139
Conclusion	165
Bibliography	171
Index	175
Erratta	181

ABBREVIATIONS

- A I.* – Ancient India
A. S. I. – Archaeological Survey of India
A. S. M. – Archaeological Survey of Mysore
B. S. O. A. S. – Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
C. L. I. P. S. – Chronological List of Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State
E. C. – Epigraphia Carnatica
E I. – Epigraphia Indica
F. N. S. I. – Foreign Notices of South India
Hist. Inss. S. Ind. – Historical Inscriptions of South India
Hist. Sk. An. Dek. – Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekkan
I. A. – Indian Antiquary
I. P. S. – Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State (Texts)
J. A. – Journal Asiatique
J. A. U. – Journal of the Annamalai University
J. A. H. R. S. – Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society
J. B B. R. A. S. – Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
J. I. H. – Journal of Indian History
J. M. U. – Journal of the Madras University
J. O. R. – Journal of Oriental Research
J. R. A. S. – Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
List of Anti. Rem. – List of Antiquarian Remains in the Madras Presidency

- Mys. Arch. Rep.* – Mysore Archaeological Reports
M. C. C. Mag. – Madras Christian College Magazine
M. E. R. – Madras Epigraphical Reports
Mys. Gaz. – Mysore Gazetteer (Ed. By C. Hayavadana Rao)
M. P. S. – A Manual of Pudukkottai State
N. D. I. – Nellore District Inscriptions
N. I. A. – New Indian Antiquary
P. I. H. C. – Proceedings of the Indian History Congress
Q. J. M. S. – Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society
S. I. I. – South Indian Inscriptions
S. I. T. Inss. – South Indian Temple Inscriptions
T. A. S. – Travancore Archaeological Series
-

THE BĀṆAS: (c. A. D. 350 – c. 895)

The Bāṇas were a prominent feudatory family figuring in inscriptions of almost all the great powers of Southern India from the fourth century A. D. to the sixteenth century. The history of the Bāṇas is peculiarly interesting in that it illustrates their dynastic drift in all directions in South India. The drift started so early that it is difficult to determine their original habitat. Inscriptions coming from different regions indicate the different territories over which the Bāṇas held sway at different times. Naturally the centre of their power shifted from one place to another.

It is presumed¹ that the Bāṇas were originally feudatories of the Sātavāhanas and after the fall of the Sātavāhana empire became feudatories of the Pallavas of Kāñchi. The earliest epigraphical reference to the Bāṇas is found in the Tāḷagūṇḍa pillar inscription of the Kadamba King Kākusthavarman. (c. A. D. 430–450). The inscription states that, having defeated the frontier-guards of the Pallavas, Mayūrasarman occupied the forest region upto Śrīparvata i. e., Śrīsailam (Kurnool district) and that he levied tribute from “the circle of kings headed by the Great Bāṇa.”² It has been rightly inferred by Mr. V. Venkayya that “the Pallava dominions originally extended into the Ceded districts and that the Bāṇas were also ruling some frontier province in that part of

1. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX p. 159; 1951.

2. *E. I.* Vol. VIII pp. 34 and 35.

the country during the time of the Kadamba King Mayūraśarmaṇ¹ There is, therefore, no doubt that in the conflict between the Pallavas and Mayūraśarmaṇ (c. A. D. 340-370) the Bāṇas let the former down and became tributary to the latter.² It is thus certain that, in addition to the difficulties of continuing the war in a distant, hilly and forest region, the hostile attitude of the Bāṇas forced the Pallavas to make peace with Mayūraśarmaṇ.

Another probable outcome of the submission of the Bāṇas to the Kadambas was the rise of the Western Gaṅgas under Pallava supremacy. The Udayēndiram plates of Prithivipati II state³ that Koṅgaṇivarmaṇ, the founder of the Western Gaṅga dynasty, was consecrated to conquer the Bāṇa-maṇḍala or country. But this statement has not so far been confirmed by any contemporary W. Gaṅga record, though Pallava paramountcy over the W. Gaṅgas in the fifth century A. D. is borne out by the Penukoṇḍa plates⁴ and the Kūḍlūr plates of Mādhavavarma.⁵ An Inscription of A. D. 459 from Dod-Ballapur taluk⁶ describes Koṅgaṇivarmaṇ as "a wild-fire in consuming the stubble of the forest Bāṇa." But no reference to the consecration by the Pallava King of Koṅgaṇivarmaṇ is found in this record. Thus the consolidation, if not the foundation, of the W. Gaṅga rule and the subsequent subordination of the early Gaṅgas to the Pallavas were the probable results of the acknowledgement by the Bāṇas of Kadamba overlordsip.

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 231.

2. See Dr. M. Arokiaswami - *The Kongu country*. p. 129.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. II, No. 76, v. 13; *I. A.* Vol. XIII. p. 187.

4. *E. I.* Vol. XIV, No. 24.

5. Ins. No. 88 of *A. S. M.* 1930.

6. *E. C.* Vol. IX. D. B. No. 67.

In the middle of the fifth century A. D. the Bāṇas came again under the Pallavas of Kāñchi and held sway over Pāṇarāshṭra which probably comprised a portion of the present South Arcot district. The Lōkavibhāga, a Digambara Jain work in Sanskrit, written by Simhasūri and dealing with Jain cosmography is said to have been copied by Sarvanandi in the village of Pāṭalika in the Pāṇarāshṭra. The Jain manuscript¹ gives us Saka 380 corresponding to the 22nd year of Simhavarmaṇ, king of Kāñchi, as the year in which the copying work was completed. Pāṭalika has been rightly identified with Pāṭaliputtiram (Cuddalore N. T.) in the South Arcot district.² The term Pāṇarāshṭra indicates Bāṇa sway over that region, and the mention of the Pallava King's regnal year reinforces the view that by the middle of the fifth century the Pallavas succeeded in bringing the Bāṇas under their supremacy.

The history of the Bāṇas for the next two centuries is wrapped in obscurity. Their fate during the Kaṭabhra inter-regnum is not known. The inscriptions of the W. Gaṅga Avanīta and Durvinīta do not make any reference to the Bāṇas though two records of Durvinīta³ mention his campaigns in the Coimbatore and Salem districts possibly against the Pallavas. Though contemporary Kadamba records make mention⁴ of Pallava-Kadamba conflicts, they tell us nothing of the Bāṇas. It is, therefore, clear that the Bāṇas were not, during this period, subordinate either to the W. Gaṅgas or to the Kadambas. The Kaśākkudī plates of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla⁵ while mentioning the success of Simhavishṇu

1. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1910, pp. 45-46.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XIV. p. 334.

3. *E. C.* Vol. IX. D. B. 68; *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1916. p. 45.

4. *I. A.* Vol. VI. pp. 25 & 30; *A. S. M.* 1936 Ins. No. 16.

5. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. II, No. 73, V. 20.

over the Malaya, Kaḷabhra, Mālava, Chōḷa, Kēraḷa, Pāṇḍya and Simhaḷa kings do not allude to the Bāṇas. This leads us to the conclusion that the Bāṇas continued to be feudatories of the Pallavas though their role in the conflicts of the latter with the Kadambas and the W. Gaṅgas remains obscure. Nothing more is known of the Bāṇa chiefs till they were overcome by the Western Chāḷukyas.

Even at the initial stage of the Pallava-W. Chāḷukya conflict, the Bāṇas appear to have thrown in their lot with the W. Chāḷukyas. An undated Kannaḍa inscription¹ of a certain W. Chāḷukya Satyāśraya Śrīprithvivallabha found at Peddavadugūru records the gift of the village of Naḍanūru and certain taxes in the country of Bāṇarāja by Eṇeyitiyaḍigaḷ who conquered Raṇavikramaṇ. Since Raṇavikramaṇ is taken to be the other form of Raṇavikrānta,² a title of Maṅgalēśa, the paternal uncle and enemy of Pulikēśin II, and Eṇeyitiyaḍigaḷ is regarded as identical with Eṇeya³ a surname of Pulikēśin II, it is highly probable that the Bāṇas became feudatory to Pulikēśin II. This view is further supported by the fact that the successor of Pulikēśin II do not claim in their records the subjugation of the Bāṇas. The absence of any allusion to the Bāṇas in the Aihole inscription perhaps indicates that they came under W. Chāḷukya supremacy after the year A. D. 635 when the record was issued. The change in Bāṇa policy seems to be an outcome of the Pro-W. Chāḷukya policy of the Chōḷas of Renāṇḍu whose territory was adjacent to that of the Bāṇas.

1. 343 of 1920.

2. Paragraphs 1-3 of *M. E. R.* 1921; *contra* Intro. to No. 46 of *S. I. I.* Vol. IX, pt. I.

3. Paragraphs 1 & 2 of *M. E. R.* 1921; *E. I.* Vol. VII Appe. No. 16.

The vicissitudes of the Bāṇas during the Pallava interregnum in W. Chāḷukya history are not known though a shift in their policy in favour of the victorious Pallavas is not unlikely. An inscription of the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa King Puṇyakumāra dated in the first year of W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya I states that Pōrmukharāma (i. e., Puṇyakumāra) was ruling over Bāṇarāja's territory bounded by the Pennār¹. The fact that Puṇyakumāra exercised his sway over Bāṇarāja's territory seems to suggest a conflict between the Bāṇas and W. Chāḷukyas and their allies, the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu. But the evidence is not sufficient to come to any definite conclusion. In any case, it is practically certain that Vikramāditya I who revived the W. Chāḷukya power must have received the allegiance of the Bāṇas.

Some of the records of Vijayāditya, the grandson of Vikramāditya I,² show that the Bāṇas continued their subordination to the W. Chāḷukyas and were in charge of the Turamara and Vaṅganūr Vishayas. One of the records³ dated in the 23rd year of Vijayāditya and assignable to A. D. 719–20 refers to a fight in which the rulers of Turamara Vishaya⁴ were vanquished by Vikramāditya Bali Indra Bāṇarāja, son of Narasimha Bāṇarāja. The Government Epigraphist thinks⁵ that the event referred to here must have been the invasion either of the Pallavas or of their feudatories. But, Dr. T. V. Mahalingam regards it only as a local civil war which was

-
1. 284 of 1937–38. For a detailed analysis of the record see the chapter on the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷas,
 2. 333 and 359 of 1920; 14 of 1947–48.
 3. 359 of 1920.
 4. Part or whole of the present Gooty taluk of the Anantapur District – vide paragraph 2 of *M. E. R.* 1921.
 5. *Ibid.*

put down by the Bāṇa chief.¹ Little is known of the part played by the Bāṇas in the military expeditions to Kāñchi of W. Chālukya Vikramāditya I and his great-grandson, Vikramāditya II.

The history of the Bāṇas for the next two or three decades is not clear. They figure in the inscriptions of W. Gaṅga Śrīpurusha, W. Chālukya Kirtivarman and Rēnāṇḍu-Chōḷa Vijayāditya. It is extremely doubtful if all these Bāṇa chiefs belonged to a single line.²

Bāṇa Jayanandivarman (c. A. D. 733-772):

It was during this period that the main line of the Bāṇas again changed their allegiance to the Pallavas. A Tamil inscription found at Guḍimallam³ and dated in the 23rd year of Nandipōttaraiyar mentions a certain Vikramāditya Māvali Vāṇarāyar who ruled over Vaḍugavaḷi-mārku. On palaeographical grounds this inscription is assigned by Mr. V. Venkayya to Nandivarman II Pallavamalla.⁴ The identification of Nandipōttaraiyar of this inscription with Nandivarman II is strengthened by the fact that the inscription does not mention the conspicuous surname of Nandivarman III viz., Tellāṟṟe-rinda Nandi i. e., Nandi who was victorious at Tellāṟu, which we find in almost all the records dating from his 10th regnal year.⁵ Another inscription⁶ dated in the 62nd year of Vijayanandivikramavarman refers to a certain Māvali Vāṇarāya who ruled over Vaḍugavaḷi Twelve Thousand. On account of the high regnal year, this inscription is assigned

1. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX, p. 163.

2. See the note appended to this chapter.

3. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 223. Ins. A.

4. *Ibid.* p. 229. f. n. 1.

5. e. g., 52 of 1895 Tillasthanam inscription.

6. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. pt. I, No. 42.

to Nandivarman II Pallavamalla. Māvali Vānarāya of this inscription is very probably identical with Vikramāditya Māvali Vānarāyar.¹ Again this Vikramāditya is probably identical with Nandivarman or Jayanandivarman of the Guḍimallam,² Udayēndiram³ and Muḍiyaṇūr⁴ plates as the genealogy and chronology of the Bāṇas of this and subsequent period indicate. This conclusion is confirmed by the well-known practice of feudatories assuming the names and titles of their suzerains. It is, therefore, highly probable that Bāṇa Vikramāditya (c. A. D. 730) who became feudatory to Nandivarman II, assumed the name of his overlord manifesting his subordination.⁵

The Bāṇa feudatory of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla seems to have assisted him in removing the W. Gaṅga menace to the Pallava empire. That the aggression of W. Gaṅga Śrīpurusha in the east included part of the modern North Arcot district is clear from the existence of a village called Śrīpurushamaṅgalam (Wandiwash taluk, N. Arcot district).⁶ In order to recover the lost portions of the Pallava empire, Nandivarman II undertook a military expedition against Śrīpurusha in his 52nd regnal year (c. A. D. 762) as

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. No. 22 Ins. A; *J. I. H.* XXIX p. 168.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. pp. 1-7.

3. *E. I.* Vol. III. p. 74. v. 6.

4. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.

5. He must have felt it necessary to do so as his predecessors were feudatory to W. Chālukyas. Moreover Dr. D. C. Sircar thinks (*N. I. A.* Vol. I. p. 245) that he may be identical with Vikramāditya Bali Indra Bāṇarāja of 359 of 1920. This identification, though doubtful, is not unlikely.

6. Vide - Sewell - *List of Anti. Rem.* p. 170.

evidenced by one of his inscriptions.¹ This inscription records the death of Gaṅgadiyaraiyar Kaṇṇāḍu perunṅaṅgar, the chief of Kaṛkāṭṭūr, who, at the instance of māmaḍi, (i.e., uncle) the Bāṇa king, fell on the day when the Pallava army marched against Perumāṇaḍigaḷ and destroyed the fortress of Peṅkuḷikkōṭṭai. It is clear from this inscription that the Bāṇas supported the Pallava King against Śrīpuruṣa.² Kaṛkāṭṭūr is identified with Kaḷakāṭṭūr in the Chittoor district and Peṅkuḷikkōṭṭai with Kuḷidikki in the Guḍiyattam taluk of the North Arcot district.³ The Pallava expedition must have been successful as the Tāṇḍantōṭṭam plates of Nandivarman II, dated in his fifty eighth year refers to his triumph over the W. Gaṅga King.⁴ We do not know if the Bāṇas occupied the Gaṅga Six-thousand as a result of this war. The reference in the Muḍiyaṅṇūr plates⁵ to the crown and throne of Bāṇa Nandivarman and the prefix of his name, Jaya, mentioned in the Udayāṇḍiram plates⁶ seem to indicate his high political status and his part-of which we know a little, in the martial exploits of Nandivarman II. Bāṇa Nandivarman and his successors continued to be feudatory to the Pallavas ruling over the territory known as Perumbāṇappāḍi (also known as Vaḍugavaḷi mēṅku and Vaḍugavaḷi 12000) which comprised the western part of the Chittoor district, the north western part of the North Arcot district, the eastern part of the Kolar district and portions

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXII. pp. 110-113.

2. But Mr. V. Venkatasubba Aiyar gives a very different interpretation. He thinks that the Bāṇa chief supported the Gaṅga cause and his relative fought for it (*E. I.* Vol. XXII. pp. 110-113). Obviously this is erroneous as it implies the unknown and unusual practice of erecting hero-stones for enemies.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. V: p. 529. v. 6.

5. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.

6. *E. I.* Vol. III. p. 78. v. 6.

of the Salem district. Tiruvallam, also known as Vāṇapuram, (N. Arcot district) appears to have then been the seat of their authority.¹

Vijayāditya I (c. A. D. 772-824):

Vijayāditya or Vijayādityadeva was the son and successor of Bāṇa Nandivarman. An undated Bāṇa inscription, found at Karshnapalle (Punganur taluk, Chittoor district) refers itself to the reign of a certain Bāṇarāsa who was also in charge of the Gaṅga Six-thousand province when Ballaha i. e., the Rāshtrakūṭa King led a campaign against Kaḍuvetṭi for not paying tribute. The record states further that, on this occasion a certain servant of Vijayitta, while returning on horse near Kuntiala, died after slaying Gaṇamūrti.² On palaeographical grounds this inscription is assigned to the ninth century.³ The Rāshtrakūṭa King, mentioned in the inscription, is Gōvinda III⁴ and Kaḍuvetṭi evidently refers to the Pallava king. It is, therefore, reasonable to identify Vijayitta of this record with Bāṇa Vijayāditya I who was a contemporary of Pallava Dantivarman⁵ and Rāshtrakūṭa Gōvinda III.⁶ We do not know when the Bāṇas occupied the Gaṅga Six-thousand. This territory lay just west of the Bāṇa country and was, for a long time, the bone of contention between the Bāṇas and the W. Gaṅgas. Another inscription found at the same village mentioning a certain Bāṇarāsa, who was the ruler of the Gaṅga Six-thousand may be ascribed to Vijayāditya I.⁷ A third inscription, much

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. III pt. I, pp. 88 & 89.

2. 327 of 1912; No. 6 of *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I.

3. Intro. to No. 6 of *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I.

4. Paragraph 15 of *M. E. R.* 1913.

5. *E. I.* Vol. XI. No. 22. p. 225. Ins. B.

6. *Contra. vide.* Intro. to No. 6 of *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I.

7. 323 of 1912.

damaged and dateless, found at Chālamāṅgala (Punganur taluk) refers to a certain Bāṇarāsa and the death of a warrior in battle.¹ This and another damaged record from the same place² may be assigned to the same Bāṇa chief. Thus the participation of the Bāṇas in the Pallava-Rāshtrakūṭa war (c. A. D. 804) is clear but not the exact nature of their part in it. It is said that soon after the defeat of Dantivarman by Gōvinda III, the Bāṇas transferred their allegiance from the Pallavas to the Rāshtrakūṭas.³ The Nandi plates of Rāshtrakūṭa Gōvinda III (A. D. 806)⁴ record the grant by Gōvinda III, at the request of Kshatriya Mahābali Bāṇarāja, named Śrīparama, of the village of Kandamaṅgala, to Īśvaradāsa, head of the Sthāna (i. e., maṭha) in the temple on the Nandi hill. The Kannaḍa portion of the plates states that the gift was made for the temple of Māṇikkabbe, daughter of Indaparāsa. The Chik-Ballapur⁵ plates of W. Gaṅga Jayateja state that, in the 17th year of Rāshtrakūṭa Gōvinda III (A. D. 810), while Īśvaradāsa was the head of the maṭha in the temple on the Nandi hill and while Paḍḍāge was the governor of the Kōyattūr 12000, Ratnāvaḷi, the mother of Bāṇarāsa Daḍḍa-naradhīpa and the beloved queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara-rāja, made a grant to the Śiva temple which she had caused to be erected at Nandi. The donee in both the grants is Īśvaradāsa, head of the maṭha or Sthāna on the Nandi hill. Māṇikkabbe is undoubtedly identical with Ratnāvaḷi, the queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara. Śrīparama Bāṇarāja of the Nandi plates is probably identical with Bāṇa Vidyādhara of the Chik-Ballapur plates. This Bāṇa Vidyādhara is identified

1. 313 of 1912.

2. 335 of 1912.

3. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 205; *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 168.

4. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913-14, paragraphs 68-70.

5. *Ibid.* pp. 35-37.

with Vikramāditya I Bāṇa Vidyādhara, son of Malladēva.¹ No doubt the only Bāṇa chief, so far known to us, bearing this title viz., Vidyādhara, is Vikramāditya I, the father of Vijayāditya II. His earliest known record is dated in the 17th year of Pallava Nandivarman III (c. A. D. 843) and he is known to have ruled for about half a century. Apparently he could not be assigned to the early years of the 9th century. Moreover he was the son-in-law of W. Gaṅga Prithivīpati I. Inscriptions of the time of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I mention his queens² Kundavai and Mahādēvī Adigaḷ³ but not Ratnavaḷi of the Chik-Ballapur plates. Therefore the identification is highly improbable and Bāṇa Vidyādhara of the Chik-Ballapur plates must be identified with Bāṇa Vijayāditya I.⁴

It is said that Indapparāsa, the father of Māṇikkabbe, mentioned in the Nandi plates, "may perhaps be identical with Govinda III's younger brother, Indra, who founded the Gujarat branch. The supposition derives some support from the respect with which the Bāṇas are spoken of in the records."⁵ If that be so, the matrimonial alliance between the Bāṇas and the collateral line of the Rāshtrakūṭas must have taken place some time before A. D. 806 when the Nandi plates were issued. But it is difficult to say whether the Rāshtrakūṭa-Bāṇa alliance preceded or followed Dantivarman's conflict with Gōvinda III.

The outbreak of a revolt against Rāshtrakūṭa Amoghavarsha soon after his accession led to the withdrawal of Rāshtrakūṭa forces from Gaṅgavāḍi. Taking advantage

-
1. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913-14, p. 37.
 2. *S. I. I.* Vol. III Nos. 47 and 48.
 3. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 227. Ins. D.
 4. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 211.
 5. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913-14 paragraph 70.

of this situation, W. Gaṅga Rājamalla I invaded the Pallava empire as evidenced by his Vaṇṇimalai inscription which records his foundation of a Jain shrine at Vaṇṇimalai, and by the mention in some inscriptions¹ of Rājamallachaturvēdi-maṅgalam. It may be presumed that in the course of this invasion, Rājamalla I occupied the Gaṅga Six-thousand, vanquishing the Bāṇas.² After that, the Bāṇas became again the vassals of the Pallavas. This is confirmed by the Guḍimallam inscription of Dantivarman which mentions Bāṇa Vijayāditya I.³

Before proceeding further, we must pay some attention to the political condition of South India in the 9th century, for it will explain many of the events connected with the history of the Bāṇas in the subsequent period. W. Gaṅga Rājamalla I and his son, Nitimārga I, were engaged in liberating Gaṅgavāḍi from Rāshtrakūṭa occupation and in checking the growing power of the Bāṇas. Rājamalla II and his brother, Būtuga I, occasionally allied with the Pallavas against the Pāṇḍyas. In the latter half of the 9th century, the W. Gaṅgas waged wars with the E. Chālukya king, Vijayāditya III. Rāshtrakūṭa Amoghavarsha was, for a long time, at war with E. Chālukya Vijayāditya II and his illustrious grandson; his protracted war with the W. Gaṅgas came to an end about A.D. 860 and was followed by a matrimonial alliance between the two dynasties. The latter part of his reign was full of rebellions. In brief, Amoghavarsha found it exceedingly difficult to adhere to the forward policy of his distinguished predecessors. The Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle for supremacy over the Chōḷa country persisted intermittently. Taking advantage of this, the Chōḷas were steadily

1. 227 of 1915; 292 and 322 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XIII.

2. *E. C.* Vol. X. Bp. 86.

3. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 225 - Ins. B.

rising to power. This state of affairs afforded opportunities for some of the minor dynasties of Deccan to enlarge their dominions at the cost of their neighbours.

Malladēva (c. A. D. 824-843):

Vadhuvallaba Malladēva Nandivarmaṇ, also known as Jagadēkamalla¹, was the son of Bāṇa Vijayāditya I. He was probably the same person as Daḍḍa-naradhīpa, son of Ratnāvajī, mentioned in the Chik-Ballapur plates of Gaṅga Jayatēja.² He had left a few records of which the Muḍiyanūr inscription³ is notable. An undated inscription of Malladēva is found at Chippili (Madanapalle taluk, Chittoor district). Its provenance is more important than its contents viz., the mention of a gift, for Chippili was at that time the capital of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu. The record indicates Malladēva's successful invasion of Rēnāṇḍu. The decline of Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu coupled with Rāshtrakūṭa wars with the E. Chālukyas and W. Gaṅgas must have facilitated his ambition. As regards his Chōḷa adversary, we know next to nothing; according to Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri's pedigree of Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷas,⁴ Divākara Chōḷa was Malladēva's probable contemporary. The course of this invasion is very obscure. We do not know whether on this occasion Malladēva came into contact or conflict with the Vaidumbas, a Telugu feudatory dynasty. But it is clear that before long the Vaidumbas were in possession of Rēnāṇḍu. It is highly probable that the Vaidumbas played a prominent part in compassing the ruin of the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷas and were later subordinate to the Bāṇas.

1. *E. I.* Vol. III. p. 74. v. 9.

2. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913-14, paragraph 59.

3. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.

4. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 248.

The Bāṇa invasion of Rēnāṇḍu involved them in many wars in the subsequent period, and the Pallavas were deprived of Bāṇa assistance in their wars with the Pāṇḍyas. The Muḍiyanūr plates of Malladēva describe him as “a sun in awakening the lotus lake of the Bāṇa-vamsa” and as the “ruler of a seven and a half country containing 12000 villages in the Āṇḍhra maṇḍala.”¹ In short, Malladēva prepared the ground for the remarkable achievements of his son, Vikramāditya I Vidyādhara.

Vikramāditya (c. A. D. 843–892)

Bāṇa Vikramāditya I succeeded his father and assumed such surnames as Bāṇa Vidyādhara,² Jayamēru³ and Bāṇa-kandarppaṇ.⁴ The efforts of Vikramāditya I to reconquer the Gaṅga Six-thousand coupled with his father's invasion of Rēnāṇḍu provoked the hostility of the W. Gaṅgas and the Noḷambas. The Noḷambas were feudatory to the W. Gaṅgas and ruled over the Gaṅga Six-thousand and Noḷambaḷge, the latter comprising the modern districts of Tumkur and Chitaldroog and part of the Anantapur district.⁵ They could not ignore the menace of Bāṇa power as their territory was adjacent to that of the Bāṇas. When Nitimarga I Eṇṇeyagṅga ascended the Gaṅga throne, he and his Noḷamba feudatory, Poḷal Chōra, waged war with the Bāṇas and in the battle of Murggepāḍi the latter were worsted (c. A. D. 853).⁶ The Noḷamba army seems to have raided as far as Kāñchi. The

1. *E. C.* Vol. X Mb. 157.

2. *E. I.* Vol. III. p. 78, v. 10.

3. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 6. v. 14.

4. 569 of 1906; *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I. No. 2.

5. *E. I.* Vol. X. p. 57.

6. *E. C.* Vol. X. Kr. 79; 107 of 1899; *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 208; *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 172.

Hindupur record¹ of Nītimārga I dated Saka 775 (A. D. 853) refers to his unnamed Noḷamba feudatory who ruled the country extending upto Kāñchi. But the Bāṇas heroically rolled back the tide of Noḷamba aggression. The capture of Perunagar² by Akaṇkattuvaraiyar, a soldier of Vāṇarāyar, mentioned in a 10th year inscription of Vijaya-Kampavikramavarman³, is regarded as an indication of the rapid recovery of the Bāṇas.⁴ But these events do not find mention in Pallava records. Though hostilities continued between the two parties, some of the inscriptions of Vikramāditya from the Punganur area⁵ show his successful efforts to re-establish his authority in the Bāṇa territory. Far from emasculating the Bāṇa power, the battle of Murggepādi merely checked their progress for some time. It is evident that the brunt of the battle against the Noḷambas was borne by the Bāṇas.

It appears that sometime after this event, Bāṇa Vikramāditya I reconquered the Gaṅga Six-thousand probably from the Noḷamba feudatory of the W. Gaṅgas as some inscriptions from the Punganur area describe him as the ruler of Vaḍugavai-Twelve-thousand and Gaṅga Six-thousand.⁶ This is confirmed by the existence in the Kolar district of some inscriptions which may be ascribed to Vikramāditya I.⁷

1. 588 of 1912,

2. Identified with a village about 13 miles from Kāñchipuram on the road of Wandiwash.
J. I. H. Vol. XXIX. p. 175.

3. 171 of 1921; *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. p. 143-147.

4. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX pp. 174 & 175.

5. e. g., 569 and 570 of 1906; Nos. 2 and 3 of *S. I. I.* IX. pt. I.

6. 164 of 1933-34; 196 and 197 of 1931-32.

7. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 230 and 244; *Ibid.* Bp. 48;
Ibid. Kr. 200 and 235.

This must have further aggravated the hostilities between the Bāṇas and the Noḷambas as is clear from a number of Bāṇa inscriptions mentioning cattle-raids.¹ An undated inscription of Vikramāditya I from Būḍidepaḷḷe (Punganur taluk)² refers to the attack on Pulinaḍu by the Noḷamba army and the subsequent triumph of the Bāṇa chief over the Noḷambas in the battle of Miniki (or Minuki). The date of this battle is not known.

We shall now devote some attention to the relations between the Bāṇas and the collateral line of the W. Gaṅgas who ruled over Kolar and the north-eastern portions of Gaṅgavāḍi. It seems that in the first half of the 9th century there was no conflict between the main and collateral lines of the W. Gaṅgas. The Udayēndiram plates of Pṛithivīpati II³ state that Pṛithivīpati I "saved Iriga and Nāgadanta, the sons of King (ko) Diṇḍi, who were afraid, the one from king Amōghavarsha, and the other from the jaws of death." The next verse of the same plates refers to the battle of Vaimbal-guṛi, but the enemy of Pṛithivīpati I in that war is not mentioned. Mr. M. V. Krishna Rao⁴ and Mr. M. Venkataramayya⁵ are of opinion that Pṛithivīpati I fought with Amōghavarsha. At any rate, it is clear that Pṛithivīpati I was not on good terms with Amōghavarsha. In the absence of any indication to the contrary, we may assume that Pṛithivīpati I co-operated with his cousin, Rājamalla I, in driving away the Rāshṭrakūṭas from Gaṅgavāḍi. It appears

-
1. 584 of 1906; 164 of 1933-34; 187, 188, 196, 197, 229 and 230 of 1931-32.
 2. 571 of 1906; *S. I. I.* vol. IX. pt. I. No: 4.
 3. *S. I. I.* vol. II. No. 76. p. 387.
 4. *The Gaṅgas of Talkad.* p. 70.
 5. *J. M. U.* XII. p. 209.

that the rise of the Noḷambas under Poḷal Chōra, the son-in-law of Rājamalla I, might have caused the rupture between the main and collateral lines of the W. Gaṅgas. Prithivipati I gave his daughter, Kundavai, in marriage to Bāṇa Vikramāditya I.¹ This matrimonial alliance must have indeed weakened the main dynasty of the W. Gaṅgas for it strengthened their foes, the Bāṇas. The Pallavas gained a good friend in Prithivipati I.

Poḷal Chōra Noḷamba was succeeded by his ambitious son Mahēndra. A hero-stone at Jodi-Dalasigere² describes Mahēndra as ruling over the Gaṅga Six-thousand.³ This record is assigned to A. D. 870. If this date should turn out to be correct, it would be the earliest record of Mahēndra. It is known from this record that when Mahēndra came to power, he wrested the Gaṅga Six-thousand from Bāṇa Vikramāditya I. Another undated inscription⁴ from Modugalapalle (Punganur taluk) refers to the raid on Pulinaḍu by an unnamed Noḷamba king under the orders of Koṅḡṇiaraśar and the capture of Kōyāṇṇūr (i.e., Modern Laddigam, Punganur taluk). It is possible that the Noḷamba king and Koṅḡṇiaraśar of this inscription are identical respectively with Mahēndra and Rājamalla II.⁵ It is not known if this Noḷamba attack on Pulinaḍu was connected with the battle of Minuki, mentioned above.

Two inscriptions of Pallava Nṛipatuṅga⁶ dated in his 26th year (c. A. D. 875) found at Āmbūr (Vellore taluk,

-
1. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. pt. I. Nos. 47 and 48.
 2. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Hoskote 9, revised edition.
 3. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1919 p. 31 paragraph 72.
 4. 318 of 1912.
 5. *Contra* paragraph 16 of M. E. R. 1913.
 6. *E. I.* Vol. IV. No. 23 pp. 180-183.

N. Arcot district) mention a Noḷamba cattle-raid on Āmaiṃṃr and the death of the son and the servant of Akalaṅkattuvarāyar who was a servant of Piṇḍi Gaṅgarāyar. The frequent raids of the Noḷambas on the Pallava empire finally led to a number of wars between the Noḷambas and the Bāṇas.

The Vaidumbas who were in possession of Rēṇāṇḍu and hostile to the Noḷambas and the the Rēṇāṇḍu Chōḷas cast in their lot with the Bāṇas.¹ They were further supported by a W. Gaṅga king,² most probably Prithivīpati I.³ Mayindaḍi or Mahēndravikrama,⁴ a Telugu Chōḷa prince of Būdili⁵ allied with the Noḷambas. The latter were supported by the W. Gaṅga King, Rājamalla II.⁶

The combatants met on different fronts such as Māṇḍavu,⁷ Mudumaḍuvu⁸ and Sōremaṭi or Sōramaḍi.⁹ Māṇḍavu may be identified with Māṇḍe in the Penukonda taluk of the Anantapur district.¹⁰ Mudumaḍuvu has been identified with

1. 314 of 1922.

2. 102 of 1899; *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 22-23.

3. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 212; *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 170.

4. *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 22-23.

5. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 197 and *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 170.

6. *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 189. *Contra J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 203 and *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 170.

7. 102 of 1899; *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 22-23; *E. C.*, Vol. X, Mb. 228. It seems that a Bāṇa chief who did not belong to the main line of the Bāṇas fought for Rājamalla II. (*E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 22-4).

8. 314 of 1922.

9. 543 of 1906; *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I, No. 11; 295 of 1905; *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I, No. 14; 296 of 1905; *S. I. I.* IX, pt. I. No. 13; 533 of 1906; *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 192; 308 of 1922; 310 of 1922.

10. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 195 fn.

Mudimaḍugu in the same taluk.¹ Sōremaṭi has been identified with Chōjemari in the same taluk.² The fight at Sōremaṭi appears to have been the final phase of the war which resulted in a great victory for the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas.

There is a keen controversy among scholars in regard to the date and result of this battle. If we fix at least the approximate date of this war, we can easily solve the problem of identification of the kings and chiefs who took part in it.

Mr. R. S. Panchamukhi is of opinion that the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought in A. D. 885.³ This is untenable because the Noḷamba-W. Gaṅga alliance did not exist at that time. Noḷamba Mahendra had turned against Rājamalla II even before A. D. 885.⁴

According to Mr. Venkataramayya,⁵ the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought about A. D. 825. This view is based on the following grounds:-

(1) Rāchamalla, mentioned in some inscriptions relating to the battle of Sōremaṭi, must be identified with Rājamalla I because there is no record of Rājamalla II wherein a Noḷamba figures as a subordinate or ally. Noḷamba Mahendra turned against Rājamalla even before A. D. 878.

(2) The matrimonial alliance between the Bāṇas and the collateral line of the W. Gaṅgas must have taken place in the first half of the 9th century for Prithivīpati I belonged to that period.

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 191.

2. *J. M. U.* XII. p. 196.

3. *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 189.

4. See 348 of 1901.

5. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 213.

(3) Kō-Vijaya Narasimhavikramavarman of the Baṅga-vāḍi inscription (which mentions certain combatants of the battle) must be assigned on palaeographical grounds to the first half of the 9th century.

Let us now examine these grounds in some detail. The earliest known date of the Noḷambas coming into hostile contact with the main line of the W. Gaṅgas, as cited by Mr. M. Venkataramayya himself,¹ is A. D. 892-3.² Dr. T. V. Mahalingam says that Mahendra began his life as a feudatory of the W. Gaṅgas.³ We have already seen an inscription of Mahendra⁴ describing him as ruler of Gaṅga Six-thousand. The possibility of the inscription being assignable to A. D. 870 strengthens Dr. Mahalingam's view. It is improbable that Rājamalla II (A. D. 870-907) was not from the beginning of his reign on good terms with the Noḷambas. In other words, the possibility of the Noḷamba-W. Gaṅga alliance being in existence in the first decade of the reign of Rājamalla II cannot be denied. We have no evidence for supposing that Rājamalla I fought with Prithivipati I. On the other hand, there is the possibility of the latter co-operating with the former in the wars against the Rāshtrakūṭas. Thus Rāchamalla of the Sōremaṭi battle is in all probability Rājamalla II and not Rājamalla I (A. D. 817-853).

That Prithivipati I was alive till the famous battle of Śrīpuraṁbiyam (c A. D. 880) shows that his reign belonged rather to the second half than to the first half of the 9th century A. D. This does not militate against the fact that he was a contemporary of Rāshtrakūṭa Amoghavarsha

1. *Ibid.* p. 198.

2. *E. C.* Vol. II. Nj. 139.

3. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 176.

4. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Hoskote 9, Revised.

(A. D. 814-878) and is in harmony with the date we have given for Bāṇa Vikramāditya I (c. A. D. 843-892). It is, therefore, very probable that the alliance between Prithivīpati I and Bāṇa Vikramāditya I took place in the early years of the second half of the 9th century. As regards the third point viz., the date of Kō-Vijaya-Narasimhavikramavarman it may be pointed out that the conclusions of Mr. C. R. Krishnamacharu¹ are solely based on vague scriptal considerations and have not been confirmed by any other evidence.

Thus these grounds are not so solid as Mr. Venkataramayya believes, for supposing that the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought about A. D. 825. Nor do the Maṇṇe plates of Rājamalla I (Saka 750) which Mr. Venkataramayya cites in support of his view, throw any light on this battle.² The enemies of Rājamalla, referred to in the plates were probably the Rāshṭra-kūṭas. The plates do not make any allusion either to the Bāṇas or to the Vaidumbas. The record is silent on the battle of Sōremaṭi. The fact of the matter is that the battle did not take place about A. D. 825. Dr. T. V. Mahalingam accepts this date with reluctance and owns that this conclusion is "based largely on indirect and circumstantial evidence."³

Robert Sewell dates this battle at about A. D. 877-78 and states that Noḷamba-W. Gaṅga allies were vanquished by the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas.⁴ This view is supported by Prof. R. Sathianathaier.⁵ Sewell based his view mainly on the fact that in A. D. 878-79 Noḷamba Mahēndra occupied the

1. Paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1933-34.

2. Paragraphs 56-61 of *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1910.

3. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 171.

4. *Hist. Inss. of S. Ind.* pp. 38-39.

5. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj.* p. 162.

Tagaḍūr region which was far away from his own country and subsequently went to war with Rājamalla II. There are some other important facts which point to the same conclusion. The identification of Rāchamalla of the Sōremaṭi battle with Rājamalla II (A. D. 870-907) makes it certain that the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought in the first decade of his reign. This is to some extent corroborated by the date of Mahēndravikrama Chōḷa. According to Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Mahēndravikrama Chōḷa who took part in the battle of Sōremaṭi must be assigned to a period slightly later than that of Śrikanṭha who appears to have begun his reign in c. A. D. 850.¹ This is in consonance with the probable period of Bāṇa-W. Gaṅga alliance (c. A. D. 855-880) which synchronized with that of the rise of the Vaidumbas. Therefore the most probable date of the battle of Sōremaṭi is A. D. 877-78. Sewell's view regarding the result of this battle is correct. The silence of the W. Gaṅga and Nolamba records on the battle of Sōremaṭi points to the triumph of the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas.² One of the Vaidumba inscriptions³ seems to confirm this conclusion.

The split in the Nolamba-W. Gaṅga alliance appears to have originated in their defeat at Sōremaṭi and was developed by the aggressiveness of Nolamba Mahendra. It is not known whether his phenomenal triumph subsequent to that battle synchronized with Eastern Chāḷukya Vijayaditya III's (A. D. 848-92) invasion of Gaṅgavāḍi. Rājamalla II's attempt to check Mahendra I's military progress in the south is clear

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 248 and 250.

2. *Contra J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX p. 171; *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 212; *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 189.

3. *E. C.* Vol. X., Bg. 62.

from the Kaḷakattūr record.¹ While Mahēndra was marching towards Talkad, his generals, Kāḍuveṭṭi and Mṛiḍuva invaded the Bāṇa country and destroyed Permāvi which belonged to the Bāṇas. But before long, Virachūḷamaṇi, the son of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I, triumphed over them.² The hostilities between the Bāṇas and the Noḷambas continued for a long time as some inscriptions indicate.³ Thus the north-western frontier of the Pallava empire was for a long time ably defended by the Bāṇas from powerful enemies and this saved the Pallavas from the trouble of fighting on two fronts.

It appears that some years after the battle of Śrīpuṇyam (c. A. D. 880), the Bāṇas became independent. A Bāṇa inscription from Tiruvallam (N. Arcot dist.) dated Saka 810 (A. D. 888),⁴ mentions no overlord. Some records of Vikramāditya I Vidyādhara, which are dated in his regnal years, probably belong to this period of Bāṇa independence.⁵ The records of his son, Vijayāditya II are dated in Saka era,⁶ and mention no overlord, thus pointing to the same conclusion. The independence of the Bāṇas about A. D. 888 must have been a serious blow to the declining Pallava power, for the

1. 306 of 1912; *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I. No. 20.

The revised edition of the same record gives a different version of the events. A certain Mahārāja probably a Chōḷa, and not Noḷamba Mahēndra as H. Krishna Sastri said (paragraph 15 of *M. E. R.* 1913) was ordered by the Gaṅga king to attack Pulināḍu.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I. No. 20; 195 of 1931-32.
3. 99 of 1899; *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 229; *Ibid.* Sp. 5 & 6.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 44.
5. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 92; *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 2. *Contra.* *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 211.
6. (e. g.) *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 227.

Bāṇas were nearer to the seat of Pallava government than any other major feudatory powers. It is not known if the Bāṇas took part in Āditya I's war with Aparājita. The silence of the records of Āditya I on the Bāṇas may be taken to indicate the continuance of their independence.

To sum up, the strategic position of Perumbāṇappāḍi enabled the Bāṇas to play an important part in the foreign affairs of the Pallava empire. The conciliatory policy of the Pallavas towards Mayūraśarmaṇ and the rise of the early W. Gaṅgas under Pallava supremacy were largely influenced by the hostile attitude of the Bāṇas towards the Pallavas. The initial success of the W. Chālukya invasions of the Pallava empire and the temporary weakening of the Pallava hold on Chōḷa country in the time of Dantivarmaṇ must be viewed in the light of Bāṇa subordination to the W. Chālukyas and the Rāshtrakūṭas. The independence of the Bāṇas a few years before Aparājita's fall facilitated Āditya I's conquest of Tondaimaṇḍalam and thus contributed, though in some measure, to the collapse of the Pallava power.

But the services of the Bāṇas to the Pallava empire cannot be overlooked. They had rendered remarkable assistance to the Pallavas in checking the frequent W. Gaṅga and Noḷamba inroads into the Pallava empire and had borne a conspicuous part in the frontier wars thus relieving the Pallavas of the difficulty of fighting on two distant fronts. The Bāṇas were perhaps instrumental in bringing the collateral line of the W. Gaṅgas into intimate contact with the Pallavas. The triumph at Sōremaṭi of the Bāṇas and their ally, Pṛithivīpati I, weakened the main line of the W. Gaṅgas and, to some extent, the Noḷambas and contributed to their mutual hostility. If the Bāṇas and their allies had been defeated in the battle of Sōremaṭi, it would have indeed brought the Pallavas into a serious danger. So far about the political role of the Bāṇas,

We shall now deal with their administrative and cultural services.

Feudatory Status:

The Bāṇas, like other feudatories of their times, dated their inscriptions in the regnal years of their Pallava overlords, and sometimes assumed the names of their sovereigns. They were hereditary rulers having a status higher than that of a governor. They had the right of waging wars with other chiefs and collected certain taxes.¹ In brief, they were quasi-independent and this status had much to do with their role-political and cultural, in Pallava history.

Administration:

The Tamil area of Perumbāṇappāḍi, like other parts of the Pallava empire, was divided into Kōṭṭams, and Kōṭṭams into nāḍus, and each nāḍu contained several villages. It is not definitely known whether Vaḍugavaḷi 12000 refers to 12000 villages or revenue units, though Bāṇa Malladēva's Muḍiyanūr grant² refers to his country containing 12000 villages in the Āndhra maṇḍala. The Bāṇas maintained harmonious relations with the village assemblies and promoted their growth.³

Military Tradition:

Like the ancient Tamils, the Bāṇas also honoured their warriors who died in battles and cattle-raids by erecting Virakkal (i.e. hero-stone) and by granting lands. A number of Bāṇa inscriptions from the Chittoor district and Mysore state⁴

1. 188 of 1937-38.

2. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.

3. Nos. 43-48 of *S.I.I.* Vol. III; *E. I.* Vol. XI. pp. 222-240.

4. 188, 196, 197 and 230 of 1931-32; 164 of 1933-34; *S.I.I.* Vol. IX. Nos. 4, 10 and 11; *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 228; *Ibid.* Mb. 92; *Ibid.* Sp. 6; *Ibid.* Bp. 48; *Ibid.* kr. 200; *Ibid.* Bp. 86.

mention kalnaḍu or grant of land to the families of dead heroes, and in one case¹ the whole village of Minuki was gifted away to a hero who distinguished himself in a battle at that place during the rule of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I. In some Bāṇa inscriptions² the gift of land is referred to as baḷgaḷchu which means sword-washing. It seems that lands were gifted away with the washing of the deceased man's sword. It was also known as Raktakoḍagi.³ The place of the death of a hero was usually marked by a stone which was called Virakkal. The name and deeds of dead heroes were engraved on such stones.⁴

It appears that these practices of honouring dead warriors were not widely prevalent in the Pallava empire.⁵ "In fact, we have no epigraphical proof of the setting up of a Virakkal before the time of Dantivarman.....These Virakkals are restricted in their provenance, being confined to the North Arcot and Chingleput districts and the disturbance seems to have come from the side of the Noḷambas and the W. Gaṅgas"⁶ In this connection, it is worthy of note that the Bāṇas were closely connected with some of the districts mentioned above.

Cattle-raid was another important feature of Bāṇa military tradition. "It is not known if cattle lifting was one of the reasons for the outbreak of hostilities or it was

1. 571 of 1906.

2. *E. C.* Vol. X. Sp. 5; 195 of 1931-32.

3. M. V. Krishna Rao — *The Gangas of Talkad.* p. 169,

4. *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. p. 143-147.

5. Dr. C. Minakshi — *Administration and Social life under the Pallavas.* p. 164.

6. *Ibid.* p. 166.

symbolical of the declaration of war by the aggressor and was the first phase of the war.”¹

Constructive Work:

A few inscriptions contain references to the constructive work done by the Bāṇa chiefs and their subordinates. A Bāṇa inscription from Guḍimallam² dated in the 49th year of Dantivarman records a grant of land for making some repairs to a tank called Veḷḷeri. A Grantha-Tamil inscription of Vijayanandivikramavarman³ dated in his 21st year and found on a slab in front of the Kapileśwara temple at Avilāla (Chandragiri taluk, Chittoor district) records a gift of the taxes, Kallāṇakkāṇam and Viḍanāḷi leviable from the village, by Vikramāditya Mahabali Vāṇarāya, for the maintenance of the tank at Avilāli.⁴ A third inscription from Maṇampūṇḍi in the Tirukkoyilur taluk records that Aṇikōvaṇ Oṇṇiyūrpīraṭṭi, daughter of Vilāḍarāya and wife of the chief Vairamēga Vāṇakōvaraiyar excavated the irrigation tank at Nichchavinītamaṅgalam and provided a sluice for it.⁵ It is not known whether Nichchavinītamaṅgalam is identical with Maṇampūṇḍi or not. It is possible that the tank Bāṇaśamudram near Vallam (N. Arcot district) was excavated by the Bāṇas.⁶

Jainism:

We have already noted the existence of a Digambara Jain monastery at Pāṭaliputtiram (Cuddalore N. T., S. Arcot

1. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 285.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 225. Ins. B; 226 of 1903.

3. 188 of 1937-38.

4. Kallāṇakkāṇam is tax on marriage; Viḍanāḷi also must be a tax.

5. 233 of 1934-35.

6. R. P. Sethu Pillai. *Tamilakam — Urum Pērum*, p. 94.

district) which was then situated in the Pāṇarāshṭra. The Lōkavibhāga which deals with Jain cosmography was written in Sanskrit by Simhasūri who was well-versed in Prākṛit as well. The work was copied in A. D 458 by Saravanandi who was proficient in Sanskrit and Prākṛit and who was a contemporary of Pallava Simhavarman I.¹ That the Digambara Jain monastery at Pāṭaliputtirām flourished till at least the reconversion of Appar to Saivism in the 7th century is clear from the *Periyapurāṇam*.

Vaṇṇimalai, near Tiruvallam (N. Arcot district), appears to have been an important place for the Jains.² An inscription from that village³ refers to a certain Dēvasēna, the pupil of Bhavanandi, who was the spiritual preceptor of a certain Bāṇarāya. The date of this Bāṇarāya is not known. The image of Dēvasēna was perhaps founded by Ajjanandi, a well-known Jain preceptor who founded in the same place the images of some other Jain preceptors⁴ and who figures in some inscriptions from the Madura district.⁵

Hēlachārya (or Elāchārya) who lived in the interval between the sixth and ninth centuries A. D. was a native of Poṇṇūr, a Jain village in the North Arcot district.⁶ He was a famous Jain preceptor and had many pupils, male and female. He was the inculcator of the Jvalāmālīni cult of the Goddess of fire which was later expounded and spread by Indranandi-Yōgindra who flourished in the days of Rāshṭra-kūṭa Krishna III (A.D. 939-967).

-
1. See *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1910 pp. 45 and 46.
 2. *E. I.* Vol. IV. pp. 140-2.
 3. *Ibid.* Ins. c; No. 6. of 1895.
 4. *Ibid.*
 5. Paragraph 1 of *M. E. R.* 1910.
 6. See paragraphs 73-75 of *M. E. R.* 1929.

Saivism:

The Bāṇas who traced their descent to Mahābali were the ardent votaries of Śaivism, though a few professed Jainism. The Parasurāmēśvara temple at Gudimallam (N. Arcot district) and the Bilvanāthēśvara temple at Tiruvallam (the same district) figure prominently in Bāṇa inscriptions. A Bāṇa inscription from Gudimallam¹ dated in the 23rd year of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla records a gift of land for a lamp to burn in the Parasurāmēśvara temple at Tiruvippiram-bēdu i.e., Gudimallam. Another Bāṇa inscription from Tiruvallam² dated in the 62nd year of the same king registers a gift of land to the temple at Vāṇapuram i. e., Tiruvallam. The Nandi plates of Gōvinda III³ record the grant, made at the request of Mahābali Bāṇarāya Śrīparama (i. e., Bāṇa Vijayāditya I), of a village to the Śiva temple at Nandi while Īśvaradāsa was the head of the maṭha on the Nandi hill. The Chik-Ballapur plates of Jayatēja⁴ dated in the 17th year of the same Rāshṭrakūṭa king state that when Īśvaradāsa, the chief disciple of the Kāḷamukha guru Kālaśakti, was head of the maṭha in the temple on the Nandi hill, Ratnāvaḷi, the beloved queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara (i. e., Bāṇa Vijayāditya I) made a gift of land to that temple which was constructed by herself. It is thus clear that the Bhōganandīśvara temple was constructed by and named⁵ after the Bāṇa queen Ratnāvaḷi, also known as Māṇikkabbe, sometime before A. D. 806. The Kāḷamukhas were held in high esteem by the Bāṇas and the two inscriptions mentioned above refer to a Kāḷamukha maṭha in the Śiva temple on the Nandi hill.

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 224; 229 of 1903.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 42.

3. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913-14, paragraphs 69-73.

4. *Ibid.* pp. 35-37.

5. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913-14, pp. 35-37.

A copy of an inscription of Nandivarman III dated in his 17th year and found in the Bilvanāthēśvara temple¹ at Tiruvallam states that in accordance with the request of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I, the three villages of Aimbūṇi, Viṭattūr and Amarunṇimaṅgalam were granted to the Śiva temple at Tikkāli-Vallam i. e., Tiruvallam and the villages were clubbed together into one and was named Viḍelviḍuga-Vikramāditya - Chaturvēdimāṅgalam. The provisions of the grant are interesting and deserve to be quoted *in extenso*. "The members of the assembly of this Viḍelviḍuga-Vikramāditya-Chaturvēdimāṅgalam shall have to pay two thousand kāḍi of paddy and twenty kaḷañju of gold which were being paid before by this Amarunṇimaṅgalam to this (temple of) Paramēśvara at Tikkāli-vallam. Of this paddy, six hundred kāḍi of paddy (are allotted) for offerings; five hundred kāḍi of paddy to the Śiva-Brahmaṇas who desire to be fed, beginning with those in charge of the store-room of the temple; five hundred kāḍi of paddy to those who beat (drums before) oblations; four hundred kāḍi of paddy to those who perform various (other) services, including the singers of the *Tiruppadiyam*; and twenty kaḷañju of gold for the perpetual lamps, bark for anointing the idol and for repairing breaks and cracks, etc.² It is very interesting to note the mention made here of persons who had to sing the *Tiruppadiyam* i. e., the *Dēvāram* in the temple. This is the earliest known epigraphical reference to the *Dēvāram* which was considered as a holy book even in the 9th century. Bāṇa Vikramāditya I's queen, Kundavai made many gifts to the Śiva temple at Tiruvallam.³ An inscription of Vijayāditya II, son of Vikramāditya I,

1. S. I. I. Vol. III. No. 43.

2. *Ibid.* LL. 16-23.

3. Nos. 46-48 of S. I. I. Vol. III.

dated Saka 820 (A. D. 898) records¹ the gift of his mother to the Śiva temple at Guḍimallam. Besides these, there are a number of other inscriptions mentioning the benefactions to several Śiva temples, of some individuals and subordinates of the Bāṇas². A Bāṇa inscription from Pudupaṭṭa (Punganur taluk) refers to a certain Jayanāgaṇ who walked into the sacred fire on the day of winter solstice and died³.

In short, the Bāṇas did much for the growth of Śaivism and in some respects anticipated the religious policy of the Greater Chōḷas. Their enlightened attitude towards other religions is worthy of note. The Bāṇas patronised learning by gifting away lands and villages to learned men⁴.

Architecture and Sculpture:

The Chik-Ballapur plates of Jayatēja (A. D. 810) state⁵ that the Bhōganandi temple at Nandi (Kolar district) was constructed by Ratnāvāḷi, the beloved queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara (Bāṇa Vijayāditya I). The same temple is referred to in the Nandi plates (A. D. 806) of Rāshṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III.⁶ Therefore the temple must have been erected sometime before A. D. 806. Additions to the temple were made by the Chōḷas, the Hoysaḷas, the Vijayanagar rulers and the Paṇḍyars. The oldest part of the temple is undoubtedly the

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. pp. 227 & 228 Ins. D.

2. 301 of 1902; 158 and 161 of 1912; 469 of 1937-38; *S. I. T. Inss.* Vol. I; No. 51; *S. I. I.* Vol. III. Nos. 44 & 45.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I. No. 9.

4. *E. I.*, Vol. XVII. pp. 6 & 7; *Ibid.* Vol. V. pp. 49-53; *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.

5. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913-14, pp. 35-37.

6. *Ibid.* paragraphs 69-73.

Bhōganandiśvara shrine. "It consists of a *garbhagriha*, *sukhanasi* and a *navaraṅga* carved with small figures and two pierced windows opposite to each other and a ceiling decorated with *ashtadikpalakas* in their proper directions with Siva and Parvati in the central panel. The outer walls have pilasters and turrets, a frieze of large images representing the marriage of Siva and Parvati, with a smaller frieze of swans above, and conspicuously, two pierced windows which, unlike the perforated windows of other temples, have fine figures of Dakshinamurti, with holes in the interspaces to admit light."¹ In short, the Bhōganandiśvara shrine at Nandi is regarded as "the finest and the most ornate of the Dravidian temples in the province."²

The *navaraṅga* of this shrine deserves special mention. The four pillars of the *navaraṅga* are well ornamented in low relief. "The figures on the north-east pillar are particularly interesting, some of the panels illustrating the story of Bali and Vamana. The central ceiling of the *navaraṅga* contains nine panels with Umamahāśvara seated in the centre and Dikpālas on their vehicles around. These figures have lithe body, graceful poise and dignified bearing characteristic of Pallava sculptures."³ The Pallava architectural and sculptural influences that many temples in the Mysore State reveal to us⁴, may be accounted for in some measure with reference to the temple at Nandi.

1. M. V. Krishna Rao, *Op. cit.* pp. 232-3.

2. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913-14, p. 12. paragraph 20.

3. *A. S. M.* 1932. p. 69.

4. See *A. S. M.* 1937. p. 7, 28 and 29; *A. S. M.* 1932, p. 70.

A NOTE ON THE HABITAT OF THE BĀNAS

(c. A. D. 350 – c. 900):

The most interesting dynastic drift in South Indian History is that of the Bānas. In a sense their history from the 4th century onwards till their merger with the Tamil population in the Pāṇḍya country in the 17th century is the history of their drift. So far as our evidence goes, their earliest known home appears to have been somewhere in the forest region of the Kolar district. We have already seen that an inscription of Avanita,¹ describes Koṅgaṇivarmaṇ as “a wild fire in consuming the stubble of the forest Bāṇa, and that the Udayēndiram plates of Pṛithivipati II² refer to the consecration of Koṅgaṇivarmaṇ by a Pallava king for the purpose of conquering the Bāṇamaṇḍala. Since the testimony of the Udayēndiram plates has not been confirmed by any contemporary W. Gaṅga record, it cannot be utilized for our purpose with any certainty. With regard to the other evidence, it indicates Koṅgaṇivarmaṇ’s encounter with the Bāṇās. Seeing that in the middle of the 4th century the W. Gaṅgas could not have been so powerful as to attempt a distant conquest, we may very well conclude that in the time of Koṅgaṇivarmaṇ the Bāṇa territory must have been situated close to that of the W. Gaṅgas. The fact that the Bāṇas called themselves ‘Lords of Nandigiri’³ seems to indicate that their territory in the Kolar district must have comprised the region in and around the Nandi hill. Koṅgaṇivarmaṇ’s encounter with the Bāṇas must have resulted in the defeat of the latter. It was probably, on account of their defeat, the Bāṇas moved into the Kurnool district and settled in a region not far away

1. *E. C.* Vol. IX. D. B. No. 67.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. No. 76, V. 13.

3. *E. C.* Vol. X Mb. 157.

from the Śrīparvata hills (Śrisailam). It must be noted that our view regarding the earliest known habitat of the Bāṇas is based on the probability that Mayūraśarmaṇ's conflict with the Pallavas could not have preceded the foundation of the W. Gaṅga kingdom.

We know from the Tālaguṇḍa inscription that Pallava rule was originally extended into the Ceded districts.¹ As Mayūraśarmaṇ is stated in the record to have subjugated the Bāṇas after defeating the frontier guards of the Pallavas,² it is certain, as we have stated above, that the Bāṇas were, at that time, ruling over a part of the Kurnool district. If, for argument's sake, it is supposed that the Bāṇas continued to remain in the Kolar district throughout the 4th century A.D., it will be very difficult to explain how Maūraśarmaṇ, however powerful he might be, was able to conquer such a distant territory. Moreover, the Tālaguṇḍa inscription does not warrant such a conclusion. Therefore our view that in the second half of the 4th century – before Mayūraśarmaṇ's conflict with the Pallavas, the Bāṇas held sway over part of the Kurnool district cannot be ruled out.

It is very likely that some time after the cessation of hostilities between the Pallavas and Mayūraśarmaṇ, the Bāṇas left the Kurnool district and occupied the Paruvi vishaya which comprised a portion of the present Anantapur district. The exact date of this migration is not known, though there is possibility that it may have happened in the interval between c. A. D. 375 and c. 425. There is some indication that at the time when the Bāṇas were ruling over the Paruvi vishaya, they were in subordinate alliance with the Kadambas and hostile to the Pallavas. An inscription

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 239.

2. *E. I.* Vol. VIII. pp. 34 & 35.

of Kākusthavarman shows that he received the support of the Bāṇas in his war with the Pallavas and Kekayas.¹ It was probably to crush the Bāṇas that the Pallava king Simhavarman I consecrated Harivarman, son of Mādhava II.² That the Pallava king achieved his purpose is clear from the subsequent history of the Bāṇas. The Penukoṇḍa plates of Mādhava III make it clear that the Bāṇas were not in possession of the Paruvi vishaya and that the W. Gaṅgas held it.³ The identification of Pāṭalika mentioned in the Lōkavibhāga with Pāṭaliputtiram (Cuddalore N. T.) coupled with the fact that it was situated in the Pāṇarāshṭra⁴ enables us to conclude that after their dislodgement from the Paruvi vishaya the Bāṇas must have settled in the South Arcot district. It is extremely doubtful whether Pāṇarāshṭra mentioned in the Lōgavibhāga is identical with Perumbāṇappāḍi of later Bāṇa records.⁵ The subsequent history of the Bāṇas till they became subordinate to the W. Chāḷukyas is not clear. Yet it is quite possible that they continued to hold Pāṇarāshṭra in subjection to the Pallavas.

From the middle of the 7th century onwards, we find the Bāṇas paying allegiance to W. Chāḷukya Pulikēśin II and his successors.⁶ During this period, the Bāṇas were ruling over portions of the Anantapur and Cuddapah districts.⁷ In the second quarter of the 8th century A. D., we find several Bāṇa chiefs figuring in the records not only of the W. Chāḷukya

1. A. S. M. 1936. Ins. No. 16.

2. *The classical Age*, p. 269.

3. *E. I.* Vol. XIV. No. 24.

4. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1910 pp. 45-46.

5. *Contra* K. Gopalan. *The Pallavas* p. 66.

6. 343 of 1920; 356, 333 and 359 of 1920; 14 of 1947-48; 339 of 1905; 691 of 1919.

7. *Ibid.*

kings but also of the W. Gaṅga, Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa and Pallava kings. Two inscriptions from Korrapādu (Jammalamadugu taluk, Cuddapah district) mention a Bāṇa feudatory of W. Chalukya Kīrtivarmāṇ II.¹ Another inscription from Chāmalūru² (Jammalamadugu taluk) refers to a Bāṇa chief who was a feudatory of the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa King, Pṛithivī-vallabha Vijayāditya (c. 750). An inscription of W. Gaṅga Śrīpurusha³ from Kōṇdrahaḷḷi (Hoskote taluk, Bangalore district) mentions a Bāṇa chief. Another record of the same king from Huḷḷēnahāḷḷi (Mandya district) mentions Diṇḍigarar who was of Bāṇa decent and who was the ruler of Kaḷbappunāḍu 1700.⁴ The Guḍimallam inscription of Nandivarmāṇ II⁵ mentions his Bāṇa feudatory. These evidences unmistakably point out that there were several branches of the Bāṇa dynasty. But the main branch must be that which paid allegiance to Nandivarmāṇ II.

We do not know the circumstances under which the main branch of the Bāṇas became subordinate to Nandivarmāṇ II. The Bāṇa chief Jayanandivarmāṇ and his successors are described as ruling over Vaḍugavaḷi mēṛku also called Vaḍugavaḷi Twelve Thousand. Vaḍugavaḷi means in Tamil the northern road and Vaḍugavaḷi mēṛku means the land to the west of the northern road. It is highly probable that there was in ancient times a road known as Vaḍugavaḷi connecting Kāñchīpuram and Nellore; and it was to the west of that road that the Bāṇa country was situated.⁶ But, for a clear understanding of the lay of the Bāṇa country in this

1. 418 and 419 of 1940-41.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 242.

3. *A. S. M.* 1941. Ins. No. 1.

4. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1927. p. 109.

5. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 223.

6. For a detailed discussion, see *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX p. 185.

period, we have to rely on the inscriptions of the Bāṇas. The existence of Bāṇa inscriptions in the western part of the Chittoor district, in the north-western part of the North Arcot district, in the eastern part of the Kolar district and in the north-eastern portion of the Salem district roughly indicates that these areas should have formed what was known as Perumbāṇappāḍi. Doubtless, the frontiers of the Bāṇa country must be at times varying.

II

THE MUTTARAIYARS (c. A. D. 650 – c. 860) :

The Muttaraiyars were a line of powerful chiefs and were for a long time feudatory to the Pallavas, ruling over portions of the Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts and of the former Pudukkottai State. "The centre of their power was somewhere in the district of Tanjore. Sendalai, at present a small village near Tirukkattupalli, appears once to have been a flourishing town with the beautiful name Candralakha, and either this place or Niyaman in its neighbourhood was most probably the centre of Muttaraiya rule."¹ As their territory lay between the Pāṇḍya and Pallava empires, they were involved in almost all the contests between the two powers. Their subordination was of great assistance to the Pallavas not only in their struggle against the Pāṇḍyas but also in holding the Chōḷas under subjection.

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Kuvāvaṇ Māraṇ.
(c. A. D. 655 – c. 680):

The earliest known member of this feudatory dynasty was Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Kuvāvaṇ Māraṇ mentioned in one of the Sendalai pillar inscriptions.² He was probably a contemporary of Pallava Paramēśvaravarman I. It is not unlikely that he established the Muttaraiya power over the Tanjore area. His role in the Pallava-Chāḷukya conflict in the Chōḷa country is not clear.

-
1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *The Pandyan Kingdom* p. 84.
Also see the booklet 'Sendalai' by S. R. Balasubramaniam.
 2. Paragraph 9 of *M. E. R.* 1897; *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 139.

Ilaṅgōvadiyariyaṇ alias Māraṇ Paramēśvaraṇ.

(c. A. D. 680– c. 705)

Ilaṅgōvadiyariyaṇ alias Māraṇ Paramēśvaraṇ was the son and successor of Kuvāvaṇ Māraṇ.¹ He was a probable contemporary of both Paramēśvaravarmaṇ I and his son, Narasimhavarmaṇ II. Śāttaṇpūdi, a subordinate of Ilaṅgōvadiyariyaṇ, constructed the original shrine of the Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai (Kulattur taluk, former Pudokottai State).²

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ

(c. A. D. 705 – c. 745)

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ was the son of Ilaṅgōvadiyariyaṇ and a contemporary of Paramēśvaravarmaṇ II and his successor, Nandivarmaṇ II. He is very probably identical with Kāṭaka Muttariyar mentioned in one of the Vaikuntha Perumāḷ temple inscriptions³ in connection with the accession of Nandivarmaṇ II to the Pallava throne.⁴ Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ was thus a faithful subordinate ally of Nandivarmaṇ II from the beginning of his reign.

The Pāṇḍya support to Chitramāya, a rival claimant to the Pallava throne, led them to a war with Nandivarmaṇ II. The date and some other details of the war are not known. But it is clear that the war was a protracted one and in the earlier campaign, the Pallava army was worsted by the Pāṇḍya king Rajasimha I. The Sanskrit portion of the Veṭṭikkūḍi grant⁵ states that Pāṇḍya Rajasimha I defeated Pallavamalla who fled from the field of battle. The Tamiḻ

1. *Ibid.*

2. 216 of 1940–41.

3. Paragraph 2 of *M.E.R.* 1906.

4. *The Classical Age* p. 266.

5. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 305, V. 12.

portion of the same grant ascribes to the same Pāṇḍya king a series of victories at Neḍuvayal, Kuṟumaḍai, Maṇṇikuṟichchi, Tirumaṅgai, Pūvalūr, Koḍumbāḷūr, Kuḷumbūr and Periyālūr.¹ "There seems to be little room for doubt that here we get the Pāṇḍyan version of the campaigns which led to the siege of Nandivarman Pallavamalla in Nandigrāma by the Tamil princes."² It was probably during this period that W. Chālukya Vikramāditya II invaded Kāñchī with success.

While Nandivarman II was in such a predicament, his great general Udayachandra retrieved the fortunes of the Pallava empire. The siege of Nandigrāma was raised; Pallavamalla was set free; the W. Chālukyas were driven away from Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. It was in the southern campaigns of Udayachandra that Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ played a conspicuous part. His Śendalai records³ describe his triumph over the Pāṇḍyas and the Chēras at Koḍumbāḷūr, Maṇalūr, Tiṅgaḷūr, Kāndaḷūr, Aḷundiyūr, Kārai, Maṇaṅgūr, Aṇṇal-vāyil, Śemponmāri, Veṅkōḍal (in Tañjai-Sempulanāḍu), Puḡai and Kaṇṇaṇūr. But the Pāṇḍya records relating to this period are conspicuously silent on these battles. The Vēḷvikkūḍi grant mentions only the battle of Koḍumbāḷūr in which the Pāṇḍya king is said to have been victorious. The Śendalai records do not mention Udayachandra who had borne the leading part in the southern campaigns of Nandivarman II. Naturally, a doubt may arise as to the veracity of the claims of the Muttaraya chief. No doubt all the Śendalai records of Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ, except a few, are poems composed by his court poets. Making due allowance for poetic exaggeration, we can state with certainty that the

1. *Ibid.* p. 307, L. 71.

2. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op cit.*, p. 57.

3. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 134-149.

martial exploits of Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ described by his poets are not a figment of their imagination. As Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ was the hero of these records, Udayachandra is not referred to in them. The success of Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ over the Pāṇḍyas is attested by the omission in the Vēlīvikkuḍi grant of the campaigns mentioned in the Śendalai records. The rapid recovery of Nandivarman II cannot but confirm this conclusion. There can, therefore, be no doubt about Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ's victory in combating the Pāṇḍya aggression which was assisted by the Chēras and the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs.¹

Not only that. He seems to have recovered his lost territory in the Pudukkottai region as evidenced by his Kiḷḷukōṭṭai inscription (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) which mentions some of his well-known titles such as Śatrukēsari, Kaḷavarkaḷvaṇ and Abhimāṇadhīraṇ.² A Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscription of (Pāṇḍya) Śaḍaiyarmāraṇ dated in his 21st (or 29th) year found in the Aḷagar temple at Śevilipēri (Tinnevely district) records a gift of sheep for a lamp to the temple of Niṇṇaruḷiṇa Karumāṇikkadēvar at Teḷḷ-Tirumāḷiruṇjōlai, a dēvadāṇa Kīḷkaḷa-kūṇṇam by the queen of a certain Śatrubhayaṇkara Muttaraiyaṇ.³ It is difficult to identify the Pāṇḍya king Śaḍaiyarmāraṇ. The Muttaraiya chief of the inscription has been identified with Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias

1. S. R. Balasubramanyam – *Op. cit.*, pp. 15-20.

“பல்லவன் வெல்லத் தென்னன் முனையக் கெடச்
சென்ற மரறன்”

“நின்றடு வில்லவன் வல்லரண் பல்லவன்
செந்தோளெனச் சென்றீடு சீர்த்தி”

“தஞ்சைக்கோன்.....கொடும்பாளூர்
காயந்தெறிந்தான்”

2. C. L. S. P. S. No. 236.

3. 421 of 1906.

Suvarāṇ Māraṇ.¹ But the Sendalai records² leave no doubt as to the latter's subordination to the Pallavas and hostility to the Pāṇḍyas. Further, there is no evidence that Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II carried his arms as far as Śevilipēri in the Tinnevely district. Therefore the identification is highly improbable.

As regards the places where Suvarāṇ Māraṇ gained victories, Koḍumbālūr (also called Koḍumbai) Aṇṇalvāyil, Kārai, Kāndaḷūr and Sempoṇmāri are situated in the former Pudukkottai state.³ Tiṅgaḷūr and Maṇaḷūr have been identified with the villages of those names in the Tanjore district.⁴ Kaṇṇaṇūr has been identified with Śamayavaram in the Trichinopoly taluk.⁵ Puḡaḷi may be identified with Puḡaḷiyūr in the Karur taluk of the Trichinopoly district. Maṇuṅgūr may be identified with Maruṅgūr in the Nannilam taluk of the Tanjore district. Alundiḡyūr may be identified with Adaṇḡiyūr in the Tanjore taluk. We are unable to identify 'Veṅkōḍal in Taṇjai-Sembulanāḍu.'

Suvarāṇ Māraṇ had several surnames such as Satrukēsari, Abhimāṇadhiraṇ, Kaḷvarkaḷvaṇ, Atisāhaṣaṇ, Śrī Tamarālayaṇ, Neḍumāraṇ, Vēḷ-Māraṇ, Lord of Taṇjai and Lord of Vallam.⁶

1. *M. P. S.* Vol. II; pt. II, p. 1254.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 134-149.

3. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. II. pp. 1254 and *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 137.
According to K. V. Subramanya Aiyar Kāndaḷūr is a coastal town and Kāri is identifiable with Kāraiḡyūr in the Tiruppattur taluk of the Ramnad district.

4. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 137.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 139-149; *C. L. I. P. S.* 236.

In brief Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ had a great share in stabilizing the rule of Nandivarmaṇ II and in safeguarding his empire from powerful enemies such as the Pāṇḍyas and the Chēras.

Viḍēlviḍugu Viḷuppēradi-Araiṣaṇ alias Śāttaṇ Māraṇ.

(c. A. D. 745 – c. 770):

Viḍēlviḍugu Viḷuppēradi - Araiṣaṇ alias Śāttaṇ Māraṇ¹ may be treated as the immediate successor of Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ². His mother Perumbiḍugu Perundēvi has been identified with the queen of Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ.³ So we may regard him as the probable son of Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ.⁴ Moreover, his assumption of the title, Viḍēlviḍugu which was borne by Nandivarmaṇ II⁵ makes him a contemporary of the latter, thus strengthening the probability.

During the period of this Muttaraiya chief the Pāṇḍya king Neḍuñjaḍaiyaṇ alias Parāntaka conquered the Chōḷa country, defeating the Pallava army at Peṇṇāgaḍam near Tanjore.⁶ The role of the Muttaraiyars in this war is not known. It is, however, clear that their territory was for some time under the Pāṇḍyas. We do not know whether the Tirumayyam inscription⁷ of this chief belongs to the earlier or latter part of his reign.

1. 402 of 1906; C. L. I. P. S. No. 13.

2. E. I. Vol. XIII. p. 138; M. P. S. Vol. II.
pt. I. p. 565.

3. E. I. Vol. XIII. p. 138.

4. See M. P. S. Vol. II. pt. I. p. 568.

5. S. I. I. Vol. IV. No. 135. sect. J,

6. E. I. Vol. XVII. p. 308.

7. C. L. I. P. S. No. 13; 402 of 1906.

Mārppiḍugu alias Pēradiaraiyaṇ (c. A. D. 770 – c. 791):

The successor of Sattaṇ Māraṇ was Mārppiḍugu Pēradia-
yaraiaṇ, a contemporary of Pallava Dantivarmaṇ. Though
the two chiefs are mentioned in the Tiruveḷḷaṇṇai inscription,¹
their relationship is not clear. The rapid but transitory
recovery of the Pallavas, perhaps assisted by their Muttaraiya
ally, from Pāṇḍya invasion is attested by the existence of an
inscription at Kuṇṇāṇḍarkōvil, which is dated in the 5th year
of Dantivarmaṇ and which mentions Mārppiḍugu Pēradia-
yaraiaṇ. This must have happened either in the beginning of
the reign of this chief or towards the close of the reign of his
predecessor.

The period of Mārppiḍugu Pēradia-
yaraiaṇ witnessed Pāṇḍya Neduṇḷjaḍaiyaṇ's second invasion of the Chōḷa
country resulting in his triumph at Āyiraveḷḷi, Āyirūr and
Puḡaiyūr over the Āḍigamāṇ of Koṅgu country who was
aided by the Pallava and Kēraḷa rulers.² As a result, the
Pallavas lost the Kāvērī region. This is clear from the fact
that no inscription of Dantivarmaṇ dated after his 16th year
is to be found in that region. The part played by the
Muttaraiyars in this war is not known. It is certain that the
Mārppiḍugu-ēri (ēri=tank) of Ālambakkam and the Mār-
ppiḍugu Peruṇḡinaṇṇu³ of Tiruveḷḷaṇṇai came into existence
during the rule of this Muttaraiya chief.⁴ The history of the
Muttaraiyars after this period is not sufficiently clear.

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 48.

2. *I. A.* Vol. XXII. p. 73.

3. Peruṇḡinaṇṇu = Big well.

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XIII. No. 222; *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 156.

Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Kuvāvaṇ Sāttan
(c. A. D. 791 – c. 826):

It appears that Mārppidugu Pēradiyaraiyaṇ was succeeded by Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Kuvāvaṇ Sāttan. The Malaiyaḍipatti inscription of Pallava Dantivarman¹ dated in his 16th year mentions this chief. He is probably identical with the Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ mentioned in the Sendalai inscription of Mārāṇjaḍaiyaṇ dated in his 10th year.² If this identification is correct, it will indicate the subordination of this chief to the Pāṇḍya. This change in Muttaraiya policy must have taken place a few years after the 16th regnal year (c. 791 A. D.) of Pallava Dantivarman.

It seems that the Pāṇḍya occupation of the Kāvēri region was of short duration and was followed by Muttaraiya independence. Some inscriptions from the Tanjore district and Kulattur taluk (former Pudukkottai State) are dated in the regnal years of a certain Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar.³ He seems to have been independent for at least eighteen years.⁴ He must be assigned to a period before the beginning of the reign of Śrīmāra Śrīvallabha (c. A. D. 835 – 862) for the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars in the Chōḷa country during and after the reign of Śrīmāra precludes the possibility of the Muttaraiyars being independent there.

Our next problem is the identification of Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar. It is suggested that Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar is

1. *C.L.I.P.S.* No. 18.

2. 10 of 1899.

3. 12 of 1899; 61 of 1895; 14 and 39 of 1930-31; *C.L.I.P.S.* No. 237.

4. 12 of 1899.

identical with Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ, son of Iṅgōvadiyaraiaṇ alias Māraṇ Paramēśvaraṇ. This is mainly based on the view that the name Iṅgō Muttaraiyar would mean Muttaraiyar who was the son of Iṅgō, and that Iṅgovadiyaraiaṇ, the first name of his father, might have been abbreviated into Iṅgō when it had to be prefixed to his own name.¹ But the Śendalai records of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ do not mention the name Iṅgō Muttaraiyar. Further, the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars in the first half of the 8th century, to which we have assigned this Muttaraiya chief, set aside the possibility of any small power like the Muttaraiyars being independent in the Chōḷa country. Moreover, we know that the Piḍāri temple at Niyamam was constructed by Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ.² An inscription of Iṅgō Muttaraiyar from Śendalai³ records a gift to the same temple, but makes no reference to its construction by Iṅgō Muttaraiyar. If he were its real builder, he would have been certainly so mentioned in the inscription. It is, therefore, clear that this identification suggested by the Government Epigraphist is quite unsatisfactory.

It is not possible to identify Iṅgō Muttaraiyar with Śattaṇ Paḷiyili, son of Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Kuvāvaṇ Śattaṇ, because Śattaṇ Paḷiyili was a contemporary of Pallava Nandivarmaṇ III and none of the records of Iṅgō Muttaraiyar mentions the name Śattaṇ Paḷiyili. Considering all these facts, we may provisionally identify Iṅgō Muttaraiyar with Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Kuvāvaṇ Śattaṇ.⁴

1. Paragraph 20 of *M.E.R.* 1899.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 134.

3. 12 of 1899.

4. *M. P. S.* Vol. II, pt. II, p. 1255.

Śāttan Paḷiyili (c. A. D. 826 - c. 851).

Śāttan Paḷiyili was the son and successor of Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiya_n alias Kuvāva_n Śāttan_n. We do not have any record of this chief. The Kuṇṇāṇḍārkōvil inscription (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) which is assigned to Nandivarman III¹ indicates not only the end of Muttaraiya independence but also the re-establishment of Pallava supremacy in that area in or before the third year of the reign of that king. The Nārttāmalai inscription of Nṛipatuṅga² dated in his 7th year (c. A. D. 856) refers to a rock-cut temple excavated by Śāttan Paḷiyili, son of Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiya_n. But the inscription does not give any title of Śāttan Paḷiyili. This is significant because almost all his predecessors had borne such titles as Perumbiḍugu, Viḍelviḍugu and Mārppiḍugu indicating their subordination to the Pallavas. Moreover the conquest of Tanjore by the Chōḷa king Vijayālaya falls, according to our schemes of Muttaraiya genealogy and chronology, within the reign of Śāttan Paḷiyili. It is therefore reasonable to doubt whether Śāttan Paḷiyili was feudatory to the Pallavas. It seems quite probable that Śāttan Paḷiyili began his reign as a feudatory of the Pallavas, and after the battle of Kuḍamūkku (i. e., Kumbakonam), paid his allegiance to the Pāṇḍya king, Śrīmaṇa Śrīvallabha (c. A. D. 835-862). The probability is strengthened by the fact that the Pallavas kept quiet when their Chōḷa feudatory, Vijayālaya, took Tanjore from the Muttaraiyars. The role of this Muttaraiya chief in the battles of Teḷḷāru and Kuḍamūkku is not clear.

1. S. I. I. Vol. XII. No. 46.

2. S. I. I. Vol. XII. No. 63.

Our knowledge of the immediate successors of Śāttan Paṇiyili is very limited. An inscription from Nārttāmalai¹ dated in the 7th year of Nṛpatuṅga vikramavarman mentions Śāttan Paṇiyili's daughter and her husband.² The inscription shows that Nṛpatuṅgavarman reasserted the Pallava supremacy over the Puḍukkottai region some years after the battle of Kuḍamūku or just after the battle of Arichit. As a result, the Muttaraiyars changed their allegiance again to the Pallavas. How long then they were feudatory to the Pallavas is not known. There is no evidence literary or epigraphical that can throw any light on the Muttaraiyars in the last quarter of the 9th century. Nevertheless, the gradual extension of Chōḷa influence into the Puḍukkottai region as evidenced by the name of the Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai, Vijayālaya Chōḷiśvaram, and by the matrimonial alliance between the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs and Āditya I³ and the speedy decline of the imperial power of the Pāṇḍyas after the battle of Śrīpurambiyam make it highly probable that the Muttaraiyars submitted to the growing power of the Chōḷas.

In fine, the great eclipse of the Chōḷa power after the Kaḷabhara interregnum and the long Chōḷa subordination to the Pallavas must be explained with particular reference to the Muttaraiya rule over portions of the Chōḷa country. In other words, the Muttaraiyars were a formidable obstacle to the rise of the Chōḷas. The removal of that obstacle in the middle of the 9th century ushered in an era of Chōḷa expansion. As long as the Muttaraiyars occupied a part of

-
1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 63; 365 of 1904.
 2. For a different reading of the inscription see *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 19.
 3. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar – *Pirkala Cholar Charittiram.* Vol. I p. 32.

the Kāvēri region, the Pallavas had no serious trouble from the Chōlas of the Tamil country. But, when the Muttaraiyars were dispossessed of it, the most fateful danger to the Pallava empire came from the Chōlas.

Moreover, the Muttaraiya occupation of the borderland between the Pallava and Pāṇḍya empires was of great help to the Pallavas in combating the incursions of the Pāṇḍyas who were often assisted by the Chēras and the Koḍumbalūr chiefs. We have already noted the great services of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Suvaraṇ Māraṇ to the Pallava empire. It must be noted here that we do not have sufficient evidence to understand the role of other Muttaraiya chiefs in the long struggle between the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas.

We have some evidence testifying to the occasional Pāṇḍya-Muttaraiya alliances, and perhaps one such alliance paved the way for the conquest of Tanjore by Vijayalaya. These alliances would have often weakened the Pallava hold on the Chōla country.

Feudatory Status:

The Muttaraiyars dated their inscriptions in the regnal years of their Pallava overlords and assumed the names and titles of the Pallava emperors. Thus, for instance, Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiaṇ, the father of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II, was also known as Paramēśvaraṇ. As regards the titles Perumbiḍugu, Viḍelviḍugu and Mārppīḍugu, these were borne by Pallava emperors¹ and were, as we have seen, assumed by their

1. S. I. I. Vol. I. p. 155; S. I. I. Vol. IV. No. 135 sect. J; E. I. Vol. XVIII. p. 122; C. L. I. P. S. No. 18; E. I. Vol. XI. p. 158; S. I. I. Vol. III. No. 43 LL 20-21; Nandikkalambagam; 365 of 1904; 162 of 1912.

Muttaraiya vassals.¹ It must be noted that some Muttaraiya records, for example, the Sendalai records of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II and the Tirumayyam inscription of Viḍālviḍugu Viḷuppēraḍi Araisaṇ² are not dated in the regnal years of the Pallava emperors. But there is no doubt about the subordination to the Pallavas of the two Muttaraiya chiefs mentioned above, for their records mention their Pallava titles – a clear indication of subordination. Therefore this procedure appears to have been a privilege of powerful feudatories. The Muttaraiyars also fostered the village assemblies of their territory,³ and, like the Banas, enjoyed a large measure of independence.

Constructive Work:

Some inscriptions throw light on the constructive work done by the Muttaraiyars. The Mārppīḍugu Peruṅṅinaṇu at Tiruveḷḷarai was constructed by Kambaṇ Araiyaṇ in the fifth year of Pallavan Dantivarman.⁴ Kambaṇ Araiyaṇ was probably a subordinate of Mārppīḍugu Pēraḍiyaraiyaṇ.⁵ The

1. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar says that "there are not sufficient grounds at present to decide whether the Pallavas borrowed these titles from the Muttaraiyars or lent the same to the latter" (*E. I.* Vol XIII. p. 136). But the close resemblance between these titles and Paḡāppīḍugu, one of the surnames of Mahēndra-varmaṇ I, of which Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar himself is aware, supports the latter probability.
2. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13.
3. *Ibid.* No. 237; 14 of 1930-31.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 158.
5. According to Dr. C. Minakshi, Kambaṇ Araiyaṇ "was either a subject of the Muttaraiyar or a member of the Muttaraiyar family itself." *Administration and Social*

Great Well was probably named after the latter. "The shape of the well is that of a Svastika with four entrances and hence the present name 'nālumūlaikkēṇi'.... The size of the well suggests that it was used both for supplying water to the temple and for irrigating the dēvadāṇṇa lands near it."¹ A Chōḷa inscription from Ālambākkam (Lalgudi taluk, Trichinopoly district) refers to a tank called Mārppīḍugēri.² This tank also must have come into existence during the period of the same Muttaraiya chief, and was probably named after him.³ An inscription of Pallava Dantivarman from Kuṇṇāṇḍārkkōvil (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) dated in his fifth year records that Vālivaḍugaṇ alias Kalimūrka Iḷavaraiyaṇ, a subordinate of Mārppīḍugu Pēradiyaraiyaṇ, excavated a tank called Vāliēri.⁴ It is difficult to identify the tank. An undated inscription from Nārttāmalai (Kulattur taluk) records the construction of a sluice by Tamiḷadiyaraiyaṇ alias Mallāṇ Viḍamaṇ for the tank called Aṇimadhaēri.⁵ The Rāśāḷipattī inscription of Nandivarman II⁶ dated in his twentyfifth year states that Pullaya Kaḍambaṇ, son of Āritham Pullāṇ, constructed a Kaṛkumiḷi (sluice or aqueduct)

Life under the Pallavas. p. 101). The word Araiyaṇ means something more than an ordinary subject. It denotes, for example, a subordinate with or without official status. The names of Kambaṇ Araiyaṇ and his brother Vijayanallūḷāṇ are not like those of the Muttaraiyars. Therefore Kambaṇ Araiyaṇ could not be a member of the Muttaraiya family.

1. Dr. C. Minakshi. *Op. cit.* pp. 101-102.
2. 712 of 1909; *S. I. I.* Vol. XIII No. 222.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 156.
4. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 17.
5. *Ibid.* No. 11.
6. *Ibid.* No. 16.

for a tank. Dr. C. Minakshi is inclined to take Kaṅkumīlī to be a stone aqueduct rather than a sluice.¹ These evidences show that the Muttaraiyars realised the importance of irrigation.

Jainism under the Muttaraiyars :

Despite the vigorous growth of Saivism and Vaishṇavism, Jainism was still an important religion in the Chōḷa country. Like other feudatories of this period, the Muttaraiyars also extended their benefactions not only to the Śaivas and Vaishṇavas, but also to the Jains. The Jain poets who composed the Nāḷaḍiyār were probably patronised by the Muttaraiyars. This literary work makes specific reference to the high generosity of the Muttaraiyars.² It is not impossible that some Muttaraiya chiefs were followers of Jainism. The peculiar shape of the Mārpiḍugu Peruṅḡiṇṇaṟu at Tiruveḷḷaṟai is worth noting. Mr. Mayilai Seeni Venkatasami says that the Svastik symbol is a Jain philosophic symbol and that it may be seen in Jain houses.³ In that case, we may regard the builder of the Mārppiḍugu Peruṅḡiṇṇaṟu or his feudal lord as a Jain. The Tamil verse of the Tiruveḷḷaṟai inscription of Dantivarman⁴ seems to point to the same conclusion. Any casual reader of the Nāḷaḍiyār will not fail to note the striking

1. Dr. C. Minakshi. *Op. cit.* p. 105.

2. The Nāḷaḍiyār, poem No. 200.

பெருமுத்தரையர் பெரிதுவந்தீயும்
கருணைச்சோரூர்வர் கயவர் - கருணையைப்
பேருமறியார் நனிவிரும்பு தாளாண்மை
நீருமறித்தாய்விடும்.”

3. Mayilai Seeni Venkatasami — *Samanamum Tamilum*.
p. 16.

4. *E. I.* XI. p. 158.

similarity of ideas between it and the Tamil verse of the inscription mentioned above. It is not improbable that Tiruveḷḷarai was one of the early Jain settlements in the Tamil country.¹ It appears that there was a Jain colony very near Śendalai.² The name of Tirukkattappaḷḷi, a village near Śendalai suggests that it must have been a Jain centre of learning in the Muttaraiya period.³ The discovery of an image of Mahavira Tīrthāṅkara at Viṣṇampēṭṭai, close to Tirukkattappaḷḷi, strengthens this view.⁴

Nārttāmalai (former Pudukkottai State) with Jain temples, monasteries, and schools was one of the most important Jain centres in the Tamil country. Dr. C. Minakshi discards the view that the Jains of Nārttāmalai came from Madura in the time of St. Sambandar.⁵ The hills of Nārttāmalai, Mēlamalai, Kōṭṭaimalai, Kaḍambarmalai, Maṇmalai, Poṇmalai, Paraiyaṇmalai, Uvachchaṇmalai, Āḷuruṭṭimalai – were from very early times occupied by the Jains and were most suited to the Jain ideals of austere life and vigorous pursuit of studies. Dr. Minakshi refutes the identification Śamaṇarkuḍagu with the Viṣṇu cave on the Mēlamalai and identifies it with a rock-cut cavern on the same hill above the Viṣṇu cave.⁶ Moreover, she says that the Jains must have utilized the Mēlamalai for their living and must have had the Āḷuruṭṭimalai as their place of worship and study. She thinks that in order to remove the Jains from this hill “the Saiva devotees and the Viṣṇu-bhaktas of the time of

1. See *I. A.* Vol. XXXIV. (1905) p. 264.

2. See S. R. Balasubramanyam. *Op. cit.*, p. V.

3. Paḷḷi means in Tamil a Jain school.

4. S. R. Balasubramanyam. *Op. cit.*

5. Dr. C. Minakshi. *Op. cit.*, p. 236.

6. *Ibid.*

Nṛipatuṅga excavated the two caves on this very hill.”¹ But the date of the Viṣṇu cave is uncertain. We have no concrete evidence for supposing that it came into existence during the reign of Nṛipatuṅga. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar, the editor of the Pudukkottai Manual (1944), is of opinion that the Viṣṇu cave was originally a Jain temple and was converted into a Viṣṇu temple in the 12th year (A. D. 1228) of Māṇavarman Śundarapāṇḍya I.² It is clear that there was a Jain temple on the Āluruttimalai.³

Śittannavāśal (former Pudukkottai State) was one of the well-known seats of Jain learning. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar says that it was never under the Pallavas.⁴ But the presence of Muttaraiya inscriptions as far as Tirumayyam⁵ in the south does not preclude the possibility that Śittannavāśal could have been under Muttaraiya influence at least for some time.

The rock-cut Jain temple and the old paintings here may be assigned to the epoch of Mahēndravarmaṇ. The new paintings that we now see at Śittannavāśal is assigned to the 9th century and is attributed to the Pāṇḍayas.⁶ Dr. Minakshi, however, thinks that the Jain cave temple and its paintings must be the work of Mahēndravarmaṇ.⁷ There is some indication that Annāṇavāśal, near Śittannavāśal was once a Jain centre.⁸

1. *Ibid.* p. 237.

2. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. II, p. 1072.

3. No. 158 of *I. P. S.*

4. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 347.

5. e. g., *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13.

6. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXXIII. pp. 348-349.

7. Dr. C. Minakshi – *Op. cit.*, p. 234.

8. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. ii, p. 1018.

Services to Saivism:

That many of the Muttaraiya chiefs adhered to Saivism and rendered remarkable services to its growth are clear from the epigraphical evidence at our disposal. A dateless Tamil inscription from Nārttāmali¹ states that the Siva temple at Nārttāmalai (later known as Vijayalaya Chōḷīśvaram) was originally founded by Śāttanpūdi alias Iḷāṅgōvadiyaraiaṇ, was destroyed by heavy rains and was renovated by Mallan Viḍumaṇ alias Tennavaṇ Tamiḷadiyaraiaṇ. Śāttanpūdi, the original builder of the temple, was a subordinate of Iḷāṅgōvadiyaraiaṇ alias Paramēśvaraṇ, the father of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II. The later name of the temple viz., Vijayalaya Chōḷīśvaram suggests that the renovation noted in the record must have taken place in the time of the Chōḷa king Vijayālaya (c. A. D. 846-871).

The first of the Śendalai records of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ² states that he built a Piḍāri temple. Where he built it is not mentioned in the record. A Pāṇḍya inscription³ found on one of the Śendalai pillars records a gift of land to Makāḷattu Piḍāri of Niyamam. Two other inscriptions found on the same place⁴ register gifts of land to the same temple. These prove that there was a Piḍāri temple at Niyamam which is situated close to Śendalai. This was very probably the Piḍāri temple that was built by Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II.⁵ The mutilation of the top portions of the Śendalai pillars and the presence on them of the inscriptions mentioned above lead one to believe that the

1. 216 of 1940-41.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 139.

3. 10 of 1899.

4. 11 and 12 of 1899.

5. Paragraph 22 of *M. E. R.* 1899.

Sendalai pillars originally stood in the Piḍāri temple at Niyamam and were later brought to Sendalai for constructing a maṇḍapa in front of the Śundarēśvara temple at Sendalai.¹ The Malaiyaḍipatti inscription of Dantivarman dated in his sixteenth year² states that Viḍalviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Kuvāvaṇ Ṣattaṇ scooped out Tiruvālattūrmalai into a temple later known as the Vāgiśvara temple and consecrated Bhaṭṭarar in it.³ A Pāṇḍya inscription from Sendalai dated in the tenth year of Māraṇjaḍaiyaṇ (identifiable with Varaguṇa I) states that a servant of the Muttaraiya chief mentioned above made a gift of land for a lamp and daily offerings to Mākāḷattu Piḍāri of Niyamam.⁴ An undated inscription of Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyars found in the Ōdanavaṇṇēśvara temple at Tiruchchattuṇai (Tanjore taluk) registers a gift for burning a perpetual lamp.⁵ Another inscription of the chief dated in his thirteenth year, found in the Tirukkōtiśvara temple at Tirukkōḍikāval (Kumbakonam taluk, Tanjore district) records a gift of sheep.⁶ A third inscription of the same chief dated in the same regnal year, found in the Uttamanāthaśvami temple at Kīraṇūr (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State), seems to record gifts of land by the assembly of Kīraṇūr and by some private individuals for celebrating a festival in the temple of Uttamataṇi - Īśvarttu-Perumāṇaḍigaḷ of Kīraṇūr.⁷

-
1. *Ibid.*
 2. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 18.
 3. Bhaṭṭarar means God Siva.
 4. 10 of 1899.
 5. *S. I. I.* Vol. V. No. 618; 61 of 1895.
 6. 39 of 1930-31.
 7. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 237. The name of the Muttaraiya chief as given in the *C. L. I. P. S.* is Koṇṇāḷaru Muttaraiyar. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar considers it an error and says that the correct reading is Iḷaṅgo Muttaraiyar. See *M. P. S.* Vol. II, pt. II, p. 1255.

Another record of the same chief dated in the same year found at Tiruchcheṇṇampūṇḍi (Tanjore taluk) records a gift of gold for a perpetual lamp.¹ A fifth inscription (duplicate copy) of the same chief dated in his seventeenth year found in the Tirukkōṭiśvara temple at Tirukkōḍikāval registers a gift of gold for a lamp by Kaḷḷārūr Kandaṇṇpirāṭṭi of Kāraikkāḍu.²

A fragmentary inscription of Dantivarman from Piḷḷai-pālayam (Kanchipuram taluk, Chingleput district) mentions a certain Kāḍuvēṭṭi Muttaraiyan at whose request an endowment of land was made to the old temple called Tirumēṇṇāḷi at Iraiyañchēri and to a maṭha, probably attached to it.³ The Tirumēṇṇāḷi temple is a Śiva temple. But Mr. V. Venkatasubba Aiyar regards it as a Viṣṇu temple.⁴ This is untenable because St. Appar had sung in honour of the God of Tirumēṇṇāḷi.⁵ "It is not unlikely that the Tirumēṇṇāḷi maṭha existed as early as the time of Mahēndravarmaṇ I, for it seems it was the presence of the maṭha that inspired St. Appar (Tirunavukkarasar) to glorify Kāñchi as a great seat of learning in this particular padigam."⁶

As regards Kāḍuvēṭṭi Muttaraiyan, he seems to have been a Muttaraiya officer of the Pallava emperor. It is doubtful if he belonged to the main line of the Muttaraiya chiefs. Mr. V. Venkatasubba Aiyar identifies him with

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 529; 303 of 1901.

2. 14 of 1930-31.

3. 89 of 1921; *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 44.

4. See Intro. to No. 44 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.

5. See the Fourth Tirumaṇai-Tirukkachchimēṇṇāḷi.

6. "Kalviyaikkaraiyilāda Kāñchimānagar - Tirumēṇṇāḷi padigam" — Dr. C. Minakshi. Op. cit. p. 208.

Kāduveṭṭi Muttaraśaṇ, a Noḷamba general, who figures in a record from Punganur.¹ But this is unwarranted.

An undated inscription from Kuṇṇaṇḍārkōvil records a gift of rice by a certain kōḍai Mayindaṇ for feeding 110 Brāhmaṇs during the Ādra festival of Tīrukkunṇrakkuḍit-tēvar.² Another inscription from the same place dated in the third year of Nandipōttaraiyar III records a gift of rice for feeding hundred persons on the day of Tiruvādirai by Gaṇavatimāṇ alias Pagaichchandra Visaiyaraiaṇ of Vaḍuvūr in Mipuḷa-nāḍu.³

The Nārttāmalai inscription of Nṛipatuṅga dated in his seventh year states that Śāttāṇ Paḷiyili excavated the rock-cut Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai, that his daughter Paḷiyili Śriya-Nāṅgai, the wife of Miṇavaṇ Tamiḷadiyaraiaṇ alias Pallāṇ Anantaṇ, enlarged it by adding a *mukhamaṇḍapa*, a *balipitha*, a *ṛishaba* and a *ṛishabamaṇḍapa* and that she made provision for worship and offerings to the God of Paḷiyiliśvaram temple.⁴ Obviously, the temple was named after its builder who was a probable contemporary of Nandivarman III. It may be noted in passing that there is an altar to Vallavattiamman at Semmattiviḍuti (Alangudi taluk, former Pudukkottai State). The Goddess is believed to have come from Vallam in the Tanjore district.⁵

Annavaśal is mentioned in one of the hymns of St. Tirunavukkarāśar and this shows that there was an old Śiva

1. Intro. to No. 44 of S. I. I. Vol. XII.

2. C. L. I. P. S. No. 8.

3. S. I. I. Vol. XII. No. 46; 347 of 1914.

4. S. I. I. Vol. XII. No. 63.

5. M. P. S. Vol. II, pt. II, p. 997.

temple here in the seventh century.¹ It is likely that the rock-cut Śiva temple at Kuṇṇāṇḍārkōvil was built by the Muttaraiyars. It is possible that the rock-cut Śiva temple at Devārmalai (Tirumayyam taluk, former Pudukkottai State) came into existence during the Muttaraiya period.²

Vaishṇavism under the Muttaraiyars :

The Bakti cult of Vaishṇavism represented by the Ālvārs in the Tamil country during the period under consideration did not fail to influence the Muttaraiyars. An undated inscription found in the Śatyagiri-nātha Perumāḷ temple at Tirumayyam states that Perumbiḍugu Perundēvi, the mother of Viḍālviḍugu Viḷupperadi-Araiśāṇ alias Śāttāṇ Māraṇ, repaired the temple and granted a village.³ Perumbiḍugu Perundēvi of this inscription may be identified with the queen of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ.⁴ It may be noted that the hymns of Tirumaṅgai Ālvār refer to this temple.⁵ The rock-cut Viṣṇu temple at Malayaḍipatti (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) was probably excavated in the first half of the ninth century. It is not known whether it was excavated by the Muttaraiyars or by some other chiefs.

An incomplete inscription from Tirumukkūḍal (Kanchipuram taluk) dated in the twenty-fourth year of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṇ states that the assembly of Śiyapuram in Ūṛṇukkattukkōṭṭam

1. *Ibid.* p. 1018.

2. *Ibid.* pp. 1136 & 1137.

3. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13; 402 of 1906.

4. *E. I.* Vol. XIII p. 138.

5. *Tirukkurunṇāḍakam* poem No. 19; *Periyatirumōḷi* III - vi - v. 9; VI - ix - v. 7; VIII - iii v. 3; IX - iii - v. 3; X - ii - v. 5; XI - vii - v. 5.

agreed to maintain a perpetual lamp in the temple of Viṣṇu-bhaṭāra at Tirumukkūḍal for the interest on 30 kaḷaṇḍu of gold received by them from Arigaṇḍa Perumāṇār, son of Kaḍupaṭṭi Muttaraiyar.¹ It is doubtful whether Kaḍupaṭṭi Muttaraiyar of this inscription is identical with the person of the same name who figures in a record² mentioned above.

One more point to be considered in this section is about Tirumaṅgai Ālvār. Pandit M. Raghavaiyengar thinks that Tirumaṅgai Ālvār who belonged to the Kaḷvar community was a Muttaraiya chief ruling over Tiruvāli-nāḍu probably in subjection to the Chōḷas.³ But this is not corroborated by any evidence literary or epigraphical. The *Guruparampara* is far from confirming it.

It is significant that in an age of great religious upheaval, the Muttaraiyars exhibited in religion a broad outlook by tolerating and patronising different denominations.

Patronage of Tamil Literature:

The history of Tamil literature during the seventh century is comparatively obscure. But in the following century, we find the Muttaraiyars figuring as the greatest feudatory patrons of Tamil literature. The court of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ was adorned by a number of poets such as Vēlnambaṇ of Pachchil, Āchāryar Aniruddar, Iḷamperumāṇār of Kōṭṭāru and Amarunṇilai of Pavadaḃyamaṅgalam. Their poems are found on four pillars in the Śundarēśvara temple at Śendalai.⁴ Vēlnambaṇ was a native

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 75; 179 of 1915.

2. 89 of 1921.

3. M. Raghavaiyengar – Ālvārgaḷ. *Kālanilai*. p. 122.

4. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 139-149.

of Tiruppāchchil (āchchiramam) in the Maḷanaḍu of the Chōḷa country.¹ It is possible that this poet belonged to the community of Vēḷir chiefs.² Pandit M. Raghavaiyengar says that Āchāryar Aniruddar must have been either a teacher of Perumbidugu Muttaraiyaṇ II or a Jain preceptor.³ The third poet Kōṭṭāru Iḷamperumāṇār was a native of Kōṭṭāru. But Raghavaiyengar's identification of Kōṭṭāru with Nagercoil (T. C. State) is not satisfactory. Kōṭṭāru must be identified with some place in the Tanjore or Trichinopoly district possibly with Kōṭṭāttūr in Musiri taluk. The fourth poet Amarunṇilai alias Kuvāvāṅg Kāṇjaṇ came from Pavadāya-maṅgalam which belonged to Kīḷār Kūṟram of the Chōḷa country. It is doubtful if he occupied any military position as Raghavaiyengar thinks⁴

These poets composed their beautiful verses in praise of Perumbidugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ. The verses are in Veṇbā and Kaṭṭalaikkalittuṟai metres. Of the twenty-seven poems found on the Sendalai pillars, many are fragmentary and the remaining complete poems are of high quality.

The *Yāpparuṅgalam* (Virutti), a Tamil work on grammar, composed by Amritasākaraṇār "some time towards the close of the tenth century"⁵ mentions a literary work called *Tamiḷ-muttaraiyarkōvai*. Nothing more than the name of the work

1. See T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar's article on *Kalveṭṭāl Ariyappaḍum Pulavargaḷ* in 'Sentamiḷ.' Vol. XXIX. p. 295.
2. M. Raghavaiyengar *Sāsanat - Tamil Kavi Charitam*. p.11
3. *Ibid.* p. 19.
4. *Ibid.* p. 20.
5. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *The Colas* p. 682.

is at present known.¹ It is not unlikely that it was composed in the time of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Suvaraṇ Māraṇ.

The Nālaḍiyār's references to the Muttaraiyars (vv 200 and 206) deserve careful examination. Dr. G. U. Pope, who translated the work into English, does not give any date for it, but simply says 'that the seventh century A. D. saw the beginning of Tamil literature under Jain auspices.'² Mr. K. S. Srinivasa Pillai says that it is worth-considering whether the Nālaḍiyār was composed in the fifth century A. D., when the Jain Tamil Saṅgam at Madurai was established by Vajranandi.³ Dr. M. Rajamanikkam thinks that the work may be assigned to the fifth century.⁴ Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar assigns the Nālaḍiyār to the eighth century A. D. on the ground that no available record of the Muttaraiyars can be assigned to a period earlier than the eighth century.⁵ This view is highly probable and is in consonance with our view that the rise of the Muttaraiyar in the Chōḷa country may be roughly dated from the latter half of the seventh century. It is not impossible that the Nālaḍiyār was composed in the time of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II. It is also known as Nālaḍi Nāṇūru ('Four Hundred Quatrains') and Veḷḷāḷar Vēdam ('The Bible of the Cultivators of the Soil'). It deals with the ethical and social philosophy of the Tamil people and occupies a position next only to the Kuṛaḷ. 'Though composed most probably by Jains, it contains

1. *Yapparungalam*; the chapter on 'Oḷipiyal', p. 486.
2. Intro. to the Nālaḍiyār p. X.
3. *Tamil Varalāru* Vol. I. pt. II, p. 44 (1949).
4. *Pallavar Varalāru*. p. 43.
5. *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalāru*. (250-600) pp. 72 & 73.

scarcely any traces of their peculiar tenets.”¹ All the poems are composed in *veṇbā* metre and are noted for the terseness and vigour of their style. The echoes of the ideas of the *Nālaḍiyār* can be very well seen in the Tamil verse of the *Tiruveḷḷai* inscription of *Dantivarman*.²

Contribution to Architecture and Sculpture:

We have already seen how the Śiva temple at *Nārttāmalai* (later known as *Vijayālaya Chōḷīśvaram*) was originally founded by *Śāttanpūdi* alias *Iḷaṅgōvadiyariyaṇ* a subordinate of *Māraṇ* *Paramēśvaraṇ* alias *Iḷaṅgōvadiyariyaṇ*. Subsequently, the temple was ruined by heavy rains and was repaired by *Mallaṇ* *Viḍumaṇ* probably in the time of the *Chōḷa* king *Vijayālaya*, as the present name of the temple suggests.³ One of the *Śendalai* records of *Perumbiḍugu* *Muttaraiyaṇ* II alias *Suvaraṇ* *Māraṇ* states⁴ that he built a temple for Goddess *Piḍāri*. We have already seen that the temple must have been built at *Niyamam* and not at *Śendalai*. An undated inscription of *Viḍalviḍugu* *Viḷuppēradi-Araiśaṇ* alias *Śāttan* *Māraṇ* found in the *Śatyagiṇinātha* *Perumāl* temple at *Tirumayyam* states that his mother repaired the temple and granted a village.⁵ This is a “rock-cut shrine containing the *Yōgaśayanamūrthi* or the God in a recumbent posture..... The main idol is an imposing sculpture lying on a serpent couch; the five hoods of the serpent, which cover the God’s head as a canopy, are half-drawn backward. The God has two arms, one stretched behind him as if comforting

1. G. U. Pope. *Op. cit.* p. VIII.
2. *E. I.* Vol XI. p. 158.
3. 216 of 1940-41.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 139.
5. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13.

the serpent Ādisēṣa, and the other represented as protecting Lakṣmī who is seated on his breast.”¹ The main idol is surrounded by a number of sculptures representing minor deities. This shrine may be assigned to the middle of the eighth century A. D.² The songs of Tirumāṅgai Ālvār in honour of the Śatyagīrinātha Perumāḷ of Tirumayyam,³ testify to the antiquity of the temple. An inscription of Dantivarman from Malayaḍipaṭṭi (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) dated in his sixteenth year states that Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ alias Kuvāvaṇ Śāttan scooped out Tiruvālattūrmalai into a temple and consecrated Bhaṭṭarar in it.⁴ This temple exhibits some features of the Mahendra style of architecture. “The upper and lower parts of the massive pillars are cubical while the middle is octagonal. The front half of the cave is a hall of the rock-cut shrine running east to west, while the rear half has a square cell, wherein is the *liṅgam* with a sort of *ardhamanṭapam* in front, wherein, the *nandi* is placed on a pedestal. On the walls are panels with figures in bas-relief including the Saptamātrikā group, Gaṇēśa, Virabhadra, Śiva, Viṣṇu and Mahiṣāśuramardani. The Durgā or Mahiṣāśuramardani panel is of particular interest; and the Goddess here as at the Seven Pagodas is represented with a benign countenance eight-armed, astride on her lion, and aiming a spear at the Asura. The dvārapālakas are, like all Pallava dvārapālakas, two armed. One of them bears a bull’s horn and a coronet. Evidently this figure represents a person of rank probably the chief who

1. M. P. S. Vol. II, pt. II. p. 1210.

2. Slightly different is the view of Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar. See Ibid. p. 1211.

3. *Op. cit.*

4. CLIPS No. 18

built the shrine.”¹ This temple came into existence sometime towards the close of the eighth century A. D.

The Nārttāmalai inscription of Nṛpatuḡa dated in his seventh year² states that Śāttaṇ Paḷiyili, son of Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ excavated the rock-cut temple called Paḷiyili-Īśvaram and that his daughter enlarged it by adding a *mukhamanḍapa*, *balipīta*, *ṛishaba* and a *ṛishabamanḍapa*.³ Paḷiyili Īśvaram is a small Śiva temple having “only a *garbhagraham*..... In front of it there is a moulded basement with a moulded beading above and frieze of dancing bhūtagaṇas. A cylindrical *liṅgam* and two *dvārapālakas* belonging to this temple have now been excavated.”⁴ It seems that the other parts of the temple mentioned in the inscription are ruined. This temple may be assigned to the second quarter of the ninth century A. D. for Śāttaṇ Paḷiyili was a probable contemporary of Nandivarmaṇ III.

The Pushpavaṇēśvara cave temple at Pūvaḷaikkuḍi (Tirumayyam taluk, former Pudukkottai State) was excavated probably by Pūdikaḷari alias Amaruṇṇi Muttaraiyaṇ who is mentioned in a fragmentary record found in the same temple.⁵ He is identified with Iḷaṅḡovadiyaraiaṇ alias Māraṇ Paramēśvaraṇ, and with his son Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II.⁶

1. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. II. pp. 1059–60.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 63.

3. For a different interpretation see *C L I P S* No. 19. According to it a son of Śāttaṇ Paḷiyili constructed the *mukhamanḍapa* and consecrated the bull with its *manḍapa*, and also the *Balipīta*. This statement is based on the wrong reading of the record.

4. *M. P. S.* Vol. II, pt. II. p. 1071.

5. 142 of 1907.

6. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. II, pt. II. pp. 1188 and 1254.

This seems to be improbable, for the Sendalai records do not mention the names Pūdikarai and Amaruṇṇi. It is likely that the chief bearing the two names was a subordinate of the Muttaraiyars. Or, in the alternative, he may have been a predecessor of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ I. "The Puṣpa-vaṇēśvara temple consists of a cubical rock-cut cell which is the sanctum, with an entrance in front. There are shallow niches flanked by pilasters on either side of the entrance, carrying bevelled corbels. The *arthamaṇṭapam* is structural"¹ and belongs to a later period.

It is possible that the rock-cut Śiva temple at Kuṇṇāṇḍār-kōvil was built by the Muttaraiyars.² It is similar in plan to the Gōkarṇēśvara temple at Tirugōkarṇam (Alangudi taluk, former Pudukkottai State), and contains a Valamburi Gaṇēśa and a Sōmāskanda group. The two dvārapālakas found here are regarded as portrait sculptures. One of them found on the southern side is believed to be the portrait either of a Pallava king or of a Muttaraiya vassal. The other is taken to be "that of a noble man, probably the governor of the nādu, and his features exhibit humility and reverence."³

It is suggested that the rock-cut temple at Dēvarmalai (Tirumayyam taluk, former Pudukkottai State) may be ascribed to the Muttaraiya chiefs.⁴ This temple contains some notable sculptures. One of them represents "a chief in regal robes with one hand placed on the hip and the other raised in adoration."⁵

1. *Ibid.* p. 1187-88.

2. See *Ibid.* p. 1054.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.* p. 1137.

5. *Ibid.* p. 1136.

The other two are taken to be those of saints one of which is believed to be that of Perumiḷalai Kuṟumba Nāyaṇār. But this is very doubtful. There is also a Valamburi Gaṇēśa, and the *lingam* here is placed on a square Yōṇipīṭam. There are later additions to this temple.¹

We have already dealt with the Jain monuments at Sittannāvāsai. There are some other rock-cut temples in the former Pudukkottai State which can be assigned to the Pallava period. These are the Gōkarṇēśvara temple at Tirugōkarṇam, the Viṣṇu temples at Malayaḍipattī and Nārttāmalai, and the Śiva temples at Malayakkōvil. The architectural features of these temples do not help us in determining their dates. No evidence is at present available in respect of their builders. Nevertheless, it is not unlikely that some, though not all, of them owed their existence to the Muttaraiyars.

1. *Ibid.*

A NOTE ON THE ORIGIN OF THE MUTTARAIYARS

There are different views regarding the origin of the Muttaraiyars. Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar regards the Muttaraiyars as a branch of the Kaḷabhras.¹ Mr. M. Raghavaiyengar, who rejects the view on the ground that the Muttaraiyars were subordinate to the Pallavas while the Kaḷabhras were hostile to the Pallava dynasty till the time of Nandivarman II, does not say anything about the origin of the Muttaraiyars.² The absence of any reference to them in the literary works of the Saṅgam period may be taken to indicate that they were not in the Tamil country in the Saṅgam period. According to latest researches, as we have already noted, the Nāḷaḍiyar which mentions the Muttariyars is assigned to the 8th century A. D. and thus excluded from the Saṅgam anthologies.³ The fact that the Pallava king Simhavishnu is not stated in any record to have come into conflict with the Muttaraiyars is of some significance. The lithic records of Mahēndravarmān I found in the chōḷa country do not allude to the Muttaraiyars. In short, the earliest known records of the Muttaraiyars are those of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ who belongs to the first half of the 8th century and any history of the Muttaraiyars based on those records cannot go back by more than fifty years. In the light of these data, we may state that the Muttaraiya occupation of the Kāvēri region is not likely to have taken place prior to the time of Pallava Mahēndravarmaṇ. In that case, the next thing that has to be examined is who the Muttaraiyars were? The fact that the liberality of

1. R. Gopalan. *The Pallavas*. Intro. p. XXIII.

2. *J. I. H.* Vol. VIII. p. 75.

3. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar - *Tamiḷ Ilakkiya Varalāru*. p. 73.

the Muttaraiyars is eulogistically referred to in the Nālaḍiyār makes it probable that it was composed under the patronage of the Muttaraiyars. Still G. U. Pope and Mr. V. Venkayya refer to a tradition according to which the Nālaḍiyār was composed by some Jain poets who were for sometime under the patronage of a Pāṇḍya monarch.¹ But not even a single reference to the Pāṇḍyas is found in the Nālaḍiyār. There is no possibility of identifying the Muttaraiyars with the Pāṇḍyas. May it be that the early Muttaraiya chiefs regarded themselves as rulers of the Pāṇḍya country in spite of the fact that they were not in possession of it? The fact that Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ II and his predecessors had such surnames as Māraṇ, Neḍumāraṇ and Śrīmāraṇ renders our view possible. The interpretation of the term Muttaraiya as lord of the land of pearls² indicates that the Muttaraiyars had some connections with the Pāṇḍya country.³ If this surmise is accepted, we may conclude that the Muttaraiyars were a branch of the Kaḷabhras and held the Pāṇḍya country during what is known as Kaḷabhra interregnum. It seems quite possible that some time after the overthrow of their rule by Kaḍuṅgōṇ, the Kaḷabhras of the Pāṇḍya country, later called Muttaraiyars, sought their fortune in the Kāvēri region where the princes of the Chōḷa line were maintaining their feeble authority in limited areas. The theory that the Kaḷabhras were identical with the Kaḷvar supports our conclusion for one of the Śendalai inscriptions describes

-
1. *The Nālaḍiyār*, Intro. pp. 7-9; *A. S. I.* 1905-06. p. 178. F. n. 1.
 2. See Dr. M. Rajamanickam - *Pallavar Varalāṟu*, p. 43.
 3. For a different interpretation of the term see M. S. Ramaswami Aiyangar - *Studies in South Indian Jainism*.

Perumbidugu Muttaraiya_n as Kaḷvarakaḷva_n.¹ The Kaḷabhra enemies of Nandivarma_n II mentioned in the Koṭṭamaṅgalam plates must be the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs who were another branch of the Kaḷabhras and who were hostile to the Pallavas.

On the identity of the terms Mutturāju and Muttaraiyar, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and M. Venkataramayya take the view that the Muttaraiyars were Pallava princes.² But there is no clear evidence for identifying the Muttaraiyars with the Pallavas. The suffix of the names of all Pallava princes after Simhavishṇu is 'varma_n'. This we do not find in the names proper of the Muttaraiyars. Moreover, the records of the Muttaraiyars do not hint at the view that they were of Pallava extraction. Therefore this view is quite improbable.

1. *E. I.* XIII. p. 143.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 223.

III

THE KODUMBĀḲŪR CHIEFS (c. A.D. 600 – c. 900):

The Vajir chiefs of KoḍumbāḲŪr were another great feudatory dynasty of South India. We have only a few records about this dynasty. Of them, the KoḍumbāḲŪr inscription of Bhūti Vikramakēsari (C. L. I. P. S. No. 14), which gives in some detail the genealogy of his line, is very important. The beginning and end of the record are mutilated; the language is Sanskrit and the script Grantha. The inscription is open to different interpretations and its date is still discussed. In order to understand clearly the different points of view in regard to its interpretation, a translation of it is given below.

“ There was the capturer of the herd of elephants of the lord

“ Of his family was Pravīrajit; the glorious Viratuṅga, the vanquisher of the Maḷava, was born of him; from him came Ativīra Anupamā who gave birth to Saṅghakṛt; from him (came) the glorious Nṛpakēsari (Lion of kings) who as a child grew up with the serpents; his son was the celebrated Paradurgamardana (the destroyer of enemy forts), the conqueror of Vātapi.

“ Of him who had a divine splendour, Samarabhirāma (delightful in battle) was the son who attacked (or killed) the Caḷukki in the battle of Adhirājamaṅgala.

“ Of him, who was the banner of the Yaduvarṇśa, Anupamā (peerless) rightly so called, the daughter of the Cōḷa King, was the beloved (wife), who resembled Laksmi

(the wife) of Viṣṇu, Sarasvatī of the Lotus-born (Brahmā), and Giriḷā (Mountain-born) of Hara himself.

“Of her was born to him the glorious King Bhūti, who bore the alternative name Minnāmālā (?) and who earned in war the title of Vikramakēśari (the lion of valour).

“The water of the Kāvēri was turned red with blood of the Pallava forces; and this warrior defeated Virapāṇḍya in battle and became death to Vaṅcivēḷ.

“After fighting the rutting elephants, viz., his foes, Vikramakēśari was living in the palace on the hill in the city of Koḍumbāḷūr.

“While the earth was ruled by him, the Kalpataru to the learned, the moon to the lotuses, viz., the two hands of the (subordinate) kings (i.e., they closed their palms together in salutation) and the beloved of the goddesses of Earth, Victory, Prosperity, Fame and Speech, Sharpness was found (only) in the pair of eyes, instability in the two eyelashes and darkness in the hair (of women); weakness in their bodies; and jostling in the pair of (their) breasts.”

“He had two good wives called Kaṭṭaḷi and Varaguṇā (and) Kaṭṭaḷi became the mother of two very beautiful (sons) Parāntaka and Ādityavarman.”

“There was the glorious Mallikārjuna, born of the Ātrēyagōtra, a resident of Mathura, the master of the Vēda and the pupil of Vidyārāśi, the abode of austerity.”

“Having raised the three Vimānas in his name and in the name of his two wives and having enshrined Mahēśvara, he (Vikramakēśari) gave to him (Mallikārjuna) a big maṭha.”

“The Yādava gave to that ascetic chief of the Kālamukha persuasion a big maṭha together with eleven villages attached to it.”

“For the enjoyment of fifty Asita-Vaktra (Kālamukha) ascetics the big maṭha that King offerings, sandals, flowers, akṣata, dhūpa, dīpa, tām(būla),
.....¹

Our purpose here is to examine whether the inscription belongs to the Pallava period or not. Fr. Heras assigns the inscription to the latter half of the seventh century A. D. on the ground that Bhūti Vikramakēśari who issued the record belonged to that period. His analysis of the date of Vikramakēśari is as follows. He states that “if the opinions of Mr. Radhakrishna Aiyar or Prof. Nilakanta Sastri, saying that Bhūti Vikramakēśari lived towards the close of the ninth century or during the tenth century, were true, then his father Samarābhirāma must be placed about the middle of the 9th century or the beginning of the tenth. Now the Chalukya Empire was finally overrun by the Rāṣṭrakūtas shortly after the middle of the eighth century. Samarābhirāma could hardly have killed the Chalukya Emperor when the Chalukya Empire did not exist any more.”² He regards Prof. Sastri’s view about the possible existence of Chālukya chiefs at Vatāpi

-
1. Taken from Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri’s article on ‘*The Koṭumbāḷūr Inscription of Bhūti Vikramakēśari*’ (*J. O. R.* Vol. VII. 1933, pp. 9 and 10). It may be noted that according to Venkayya the beginning of the inscription refers to the “vanquisher of the Pāṇḍya elephants” whose name is lost. (Paragraph 85 of *M. E. R.* 1908). But the name, Pāṇḍya is not seen in Prof. K. A. N. Sastri’s edition.
 2. *J. R. A. S.* 1934. pp. 34–35.

under the Rāshtrakūṭas as absolutely improbable and unwarranted.¹ In Fr. Heras's opinion, the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs were feudatory to Pallava Mahēndravarmaṇ I and his son Narasimhavarmaṇ I and took part in the Pallava expedition to Vātāpi. In other words, Fr. Heras thinks that the conquest of Vātāpi mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record is no other than the conquest of Vātāpi effected by Narasimhavarmaṇ I and that Paradurgamardana claims for himself the laurels obtained on the battle-field while fighting under his overlord.² In order to strengthen his view, the same scholar identifies Paradurgamardana with one of the three kings who, according to the Kurnool plates of Vikramāditya I³ defeated Pulikēśin II.

Samarābirāma, who claims to have defeated or killed a Chāḷukya at the battle of Adhirājamaṅgala, is supposed by Fr. Heras to have borne a conspicuous part in the war between Pulikēśin II and Narasimhavarmaṇ I. The same scholar thinks that the battle at Adhirājamaṅgala mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record may be identified with the battle of Maṇimaṅgala, mentioned in the Kūram plates of Paramēśvaravarmaṇ I.⁴ "Indeed, there is nothing far-fetched in the supposition that Samarābhirāma, as heir apparent, accompanied his father in the war of the Pallavas against the Chalukyas, and that in the midst of the turmoil of battle, he was fortunate enough to find himself in the face of the Chalukya monarch, near enough to deal him a death-stroke."⁵ This achievement of Samarābhirāma as crown-prince is stated

1. *Ibid.*

2. *Ibid.* p. 36.

3. *J. B. B. R. A. S.* XVI. p. 226.

4. *J. R. A. S.* 1934, p. 37.

5. *Ibid.* p. 38.

to have been mentioned under his name as king.¹ Long before Fr. Heras, Mr. S. M. Edwardes, expressed the same views about the achievements of Paradurgamardana and his son, Samarābhirāma.²

The chronology of the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs is fixed by Fr. Heras as follows:

“ A. D. 630 — Reign of Paradurgamardana
(continued).

A. D. 640-2 — Probable death of Pāradurgamardana and beginning of reign of Samarābhirāma.

A. D. 665-7 — Probable end of reign of Samarābhirāma and beginning of reign of Bhūti Vikramakēśari.”³

Fr. Heras then proceeds to determine the date when Bhūti Vikramakēśari came into conflict with the Pallavas and the Pāṇdyas. He states that the Chōḷa power was revived in the latter half of the seventh century A. D. by Kō-cheṅgaṇāṇ, who is described by Tirumaṅgai Āḷvār as “the vanquisher of the southern king and the lords of Kuḍagu, koṅgu and the lord of the Southern Tamil country and the Northern King,” that the matrimonial alliance between the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs and the Chōḷas of this period greatly contributed to it and that Bhūti Vikramakēśari was a subordinate of Kō-cheṅgaṇāṇ and helped the Chōḷa king in defeating the Pallavas and the Pāṇdyas. Vikramakēśari’s campaigns against the Pallavas,

1. *Ibid.*

2. See Mr. Edwards’s article on ‘*The Kannaḍa poets*’.

I. A. Vol. 55 (1926) p. 72.

3. *J. R. A. S.*, 1934, p. 41.

the Pāṇdyas and the Vaṅjivēḷs are thus taken to be the same as those of Kō-cheṅgaṇāḷ. The existence in the Chōḷa country of Pallava inscriptions of the 8th and 9th centuries is considered as indicating the serious set-backs experienced by the Chōḷas and the re-establishment of Pallava supremacy in the Chōḷa country in the reign of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla.²

As regards the architecture of the Mūvarkōvil temple (at Koḍumbāḷūr), Fr. Heras remarks as follows: "The only serious objection against our views as regards this Koḍumbāḷūr chronology is archaeological. The temples of Koḍumbāḷūr built by Bhūti Vikramakēśari seem to belong to a much later period. The general style of the temples, the technique of the sculpture and the system of construction appear Chōḷa rather than Pallava, and look more of the tenth century than of the seventh. Yet between this objection and the objection of the capture of Badāmi and the slaying of the Chalukya king in the ninth or tenth centuries, the former seems to be more easily solved. As a matter of fact, the Koḍumbāḷūr temples may be classified as an "archaeological puzzle" or as "an architectural phenomenon." If those temples are finally placed in the tenth or even in the eleventh century, you will still have the square cupola-like umbrella of the top of the vimāna – without precedent and without consequent, totally unique in South Indian architecture – without a satisfactory explanation. Bhūti Vikramakēśari or his architect or perhaps both, were geniuses much beyond their age. Had the style of Koḍumbāḷūr found followers, a new style of architecture would have existed in South India. But now the temples are like an isolated instance of the work of a genius that found no followers."¹

1. *Ibid.* pp. 42-44.

2. *Ibid.* p. 38, Foot-note No. 3.

Fr. Heras's interpretation of the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription requires careful examination. If Samarābhiraṃa was really the slayer of Pulikēśin II, he would have been so mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record. Bhūti Vikramakēśari could not have forgotten such a great achievement of his father. The confirmatory evidence, which Fr. Heras cites in support of his view, is far from being satisfactory.

Fr. Heras's view that Bhūti Vikramakēśari was a contemporary of Kō-cheṅgaṇāṇ is based on slippery ground, for the date of Kō-cheṅgaṇāṇ is still debated. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri¹ and Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar² assign this Chōḷa king to the Saṅgam period. Dr. Rajamanikkam says that Kō-cheṅgaṇāṇ belongs to the middle of the 5th century A. D.³ If Kō-cheṅgaṇāṇ lived in the seventh century A. D. and if he was so great a monarch as Tirumaṅgai Āḷvār describes, he would have certainly left at least a few stone records. But, to our great surprise, nothing has come down to us. In brief, Fr. Heras's account of the resuscitation of the Chōḷa power in the latter half of the seventh century requires clear evidence.⁴

Fr. Heras has failed to identify Virapaṇḍya who is mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record. Nor does he give any explanation regarding the mention in the tenth century Chōḷa records of the names of the two queens of Bhūti Vikramakēśari, Varaguṇa and Kaṇṇaḷi.

Mr. S. R. Balasubramanyam and Mr. K. Venkataranga Raju do not accept Fr. Heras's views about the *vimāna* of the

1. *The Cōḷas*. pp. 51-53.

2. *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalāṅgu* (250-600 A. D.), p. 72.

3. *Periyapurāṇa Āraichchi*. p. 94.

4. See *J. R. A. S.* 1935, pp. 480 and 481.

Mūvarkōvil temple. According to them "the Kodumbāḷūr vimāna is not an isolated and unique work of a genius, but it has precedents and consequents. It will be seen that the Sikharas of Kāḷiyapaṭṭi, Koḍumbāḷūr, Ēṇādi, Tirukkattalai, Tiruppūr, Viśālūr and we may add even the distant Saṅga-mēśvara temple at Paṭṭaḍakkal, of perhaps the 8th century - are very similar."¹

Dr M. Arokiaswami, who concurs with Fr. Heras in interpreting the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription, suggests that Virapāṇḍya, who was defeated by Vikramakēśari, may be identified with Arikēsarivarmaṇ (c. A.D. 670-c.710).² But it is not known whether Arikēsarivarmaṇ had the title, Virapāṇḍya.

It is, therefore, not possible to assign the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription to the seventh century A. D.

Mr. S. M. Edwardes holds a slightly different view. According to him, the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription of Vikramakēśari is assignable to the eighth century, for, Vidyārasi of this record is identical with the Śaiva preceptor of the same name mentioned in a Tagaḍūr inscription³ which cannot be of later date than the eighth century.⁴ The date of the Tagaḍūr inscription is based on the ground that it contains old Kannaḍa terminations such as "baredon vannipom, bannipom." Obviously, the conclusion is based on doubtful linguistic data and can be hardly regarded as final. Naturally, Edwardes's date for the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription is very doubtful.

1. *J. O. R.* Vol. XII. (1938). p. 69.

2. *The Early History of the Veḷḷār Basin.* p. 86.

3. 309 of 1901.

4. *I. A.* Vol. 55 (1926). pp. 72-73.

On the other hand, Mr. V. Venkayya refers the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription to the first half of the tenth century stating that the script of it belongs to that period and that Virapāṇḍya, who was overcome by Bhūti Vikramakēśari, is identical with Virapāṇḍya with whom the Chōḷa king Āditya II Karikāla, son of Śundara Chōḷa fought in his youth.¹ The Epigraphist refers to a Rājakēśari inscription from Tiruppalattūr (Trichinopoly district) which mentions Kaṇṇalipirāṭṭi,² one of the wives of Bhūti Vikramakēśari.³

In his learned article on the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription,⁴ Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri accepts Venkayya's date for the record and furnishes some additional details in support of his view. He considers at some length the relations between the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs and Chōḷas of Vijayālaya line and comes to the conclusion that Bhūti Vikramakēśari was a subordinate of Śundara Chōḷa Parāntaka II (A. D. 956-70) and his son Āditya II Karikāla. The naming of Vikramakēśari's sons after Parāntaka II and Āditya II and the references to the two wives of Vikramakēśari in some epigraphs of Āditya II⁵ are thus seen in harmony with the conclusion expressed above.⁶

Further, Prof. Sastri states that "the conquest of Vātāpi by Paradurgamardana has nothing to do with the two Invasions of Vātāpi in the seventh century, in the reigns of the Pallava kings Narasimhavarman I and Paramēśvaravarman I,"⁷ that Samarābhirāma's triumph over a Chāḷukya at

1. Paragraph 88 of *M. E. R.* 1908.

- 2. 273 of 1903.

3. Paragraph 90 of *M. E. R.* 1908.

4. *J. O. R.* Vol. VII. (1933) pp. 1-8.

5. 287 of 1911; 273 of 1903; *E. I.* Vol. XX. p. 54.

6. *J. O. R.* Vol. VII. p. 4.

7. *Ibid.* p. 7.

the battle of Adhirājamangalam is connected with the Rāshtrakūta invasion of the Chōla country in the first half of the tenth century and that Bhūti Vikramakēśari's wars against the Pallavas and Vāṇjivēls were of the nature of local conflicts in which he got the better of other local feudatories less enterprising than himself.¹ It is significant that Prof. Sastri's date for Bhūti Vikramakēśari is in consonance with the fact that the architectural style of the Mūvarkōvil at Koḍumbāḷūr belongs to the tenth century A. D. In brief, Prof. Sastri's view on the date of the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription of Bhūti Vikramakēśari is least objectionable and most probable. For our purpose, therefore, the record cannot be used with any certainty.

One of the Sendalai pillar inscriptions states that Perumbidugu Muttaraiyaṇ II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ, an elder contemporary of Nandivarman II (c. A.D. 710–c.775) destroyed Koḍumbāḷūr.² It was probably in the course of his wars against the Pāṇdyās that Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ overpowered the Vēḷir chiefs of Koḍumbāḷūr. It seems that the latter's support to the Pāṇdyas was the cause of the conflict mentioned above.

It is interesting to note that some Pallava inscriptions of the ninth century mention a few Vēḷir chiefs. An inscription from Tiruveḷḷarai (Lalgudi Taluk, Trichinopoly district) dated in the sixth year of Nandivarman III mentions a certain Mārppidugu Iḷaṅgōvēḷar Śattaṇ.³ It is not clear whether Mārppidugu Iḷaṅgōvēḷar was a Vēḷir chief of Koḍumbāḷūr or, as Dr. Arokiaswami thinks, a Vēḷir officer under the

1. *Ibid.*

2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII, p. 142.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 48; 88 of 1910.

Muttaraiyars.¹ The record, however, indicates the Muttaraiya-Vēḷir connections during the period under consideration. Another inscription from Kīḷūr (Tirukkoyilūr taluk, S. Arcot district) dated in the eleventh year of Nandivarman III seems to record a gift of gold for a lamp to the God of Tirukkōvilūr in Malāṭṭukkuṟukkai Kūṟram by a lady, who was the wife of Śāttan Maṟavan and a daughter of Viḍēlviḍugu Iḷaṅgō-Adhiyaraiyaṇ alias Vikrama Bhūti.² Another fragmentary inscription from the same place dated in the sixteenth or eleventh year of the same Pallava king records a gift of gold by Teṇṇavan Māṟaṇ Bhūti.³ It is practically certain that this chief is identical with Vikrama Bhūti of the preceding record. Vikrama Bhūti was very probably a Vēḷir chief of Koḍumbālūr. His title, Viḍēlviḍugu, indicates his subordination to the Pallavas. Another fragmentary inscription from Tiruvoṟriyūr (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) dated in the regnal year of Pallava Kō-Vijaya Kampavarman records an agreement made by the assembly of Vaikāṭṭūr to provide offerings to the God Mahādēva at Tiruvoṟriyūr, on the day of Śaṅkarānti, for the interest on 27 kaḷaṅju of gold received by them from Pūdi-Arindigai, wife of Viḍēlviḍugu (Iḷaṅgōvē)ḷār of Koḍumbālūr.⁴ Very little is known of the role of these Vēḷir chiefs in the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars of the period under review.

It is suggested that Vikkiyaṇṇaṇ, who assisted the Chōḷa king Āditya I in his military campaigns, was probably a

1. *The Early History of the Veḷḷār Basin*. p. 95.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 924; 295 of 102. The inscription is damaged at several places.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 925; 296 of 1902.

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 103; 174 of 1912.

chief of Koḍumbāḷūr.¹ But this is doubtful.² It is, however, probable that before Āditya I's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam, the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs became the subordinate allies of the Chōḷas of Tanjore. It is not known whether Mallan Viḍumaṇ alias Tenṇavaṇ Tamiḷ-Adhiyaraiyaṇ, who renovated the Śiva temple at Nārttamaḷai³ was a Vēḷir chief of Koḍumbāḷūr or a subordinate of the Muttaraiyars. If the former suggestion is correct, it would mean that in the time of Mallan Viḍumaṇ (c. A.D. 850– c. 875) the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs became feudatory to the Chōḷa king Vijayālaya because the temple was named after Vijayālaya after renovation. It will be clear, from the foregoing pages, that the evidences at our disposal are not sufficient for any detailed investigation regarding the nature and consequences of Pallava-Vēḷir connections.

1. Paragraph 11 of *M. E. R.* 1912.

2. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.*, p. 115.

3. 216 of 1940–41.

IV

THE CHŌLAS OF URAIYŪR AND PAḷAIYĀRAI-

(c. A. D. 575 - c. 895):

The history of the Chōlas after the Saṅgam period till the capture of Tanjore by Vijayālaya in the 9th century is obscure. The Kaḷabhra occupation of the Chōḷa country resulted in the decline and dispersal of the Chōḷas as evidenced by the existence of several Chōḷa princes in many places not only in the Kāvērī region but also in the Telugu country. As regards the Chōḷas of the Tamil country we find them in the 7th century ruling from Uṟaiyūr and Paḷaiyārai.¹ It is not possible in the present state of our knowledge to make any separate study except in one or two cases of the role either of the Chōḷas of Uṟaiyūr or of the Chōḷas of Paḷaiyārai in the affairs of the Pallava empire. As far as our period of investigation is concerned it begins with Pallava conquest of the Chōḷa country.

According to the Kaśakkuḍi plates of Nandivarman II² Simhavishṇu conquered a Chōḷa king along with the Kaḷabhra and Mālava rulers. The existence of a village called Simhavishṇuchaturvēdimāṅgalam, referred to in an inscription of

-
1. Mr. V. Venkayya's view that Uṟaiyūr continued to be the capital of the Chōḷas during all this period (A. S. I. 1905-6, p. 178) is supported by literary and epigraphical evidences. As regards Paḷayārai Prof. T. P. Minakshisundaram and Sri T.V. Sadasiva Pandarathar have brought out its importance as a Chōḷa capital. See the article on Paḷayārai in *J. A. U.* Vol. XVI, pp. 26-36
 4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II, pt. V. P. 356.

Uttama Chōḷa¹ confirms the Kaśākkūḍi plates in respect of Simhavishṇu's conquest of the Chōḷa country. Though it is not clear whether the Pallavas conquered the whole or part of the Chōḷa country² it is practically certain that the Chōḷas were reduced to a subordinate position.³

The Tamil work *Periyapurāṇam* mentions a Chōḷa king of Paḷaiyārai in connection with St. Appar's pilgrimage to that place.⁴ But his relations with the Pallavas are not clear. It is known from the hymns of St. Sambandar that Nedumāran, identifiable with Arikēsari Māravarman (c. A. D. 640-670), had a Chōḷa princess by name Maṅgaiyarkkaraśi for his queen.⁵ This matrimonial alliance between the Chōḷas and the Pāṇḍyas seems to have been preceded by a conflict as the Vēḷvikkūḍi grant indicates.⁶ The Pāṇḍya-Chōḷa alliance, noted, above, appears to have had no adverse effect on Pallava sway over the Chōḷa country.

In regard to the role of the Chōḷas in the earlier conflicts between the Pallavas and the W. Chālukyas a few scraps of debatable information are available. The Aihoḷe inscription of Pulikēśin II⁷ states that he crossed the Kāvēri, made

1. No. 265 of 1907.
2. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar thinks that the Chōḷa country south of Trichinopoly was never under Pallava rule. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 347.
3. *Contra* V. Venkayya. *A. S. I.* 1905-6. p. 176.
4. *Vide. Tirunāvukkasar purāṇam.*
5. St. Sambandar's Tiruvālavāy padigam Nos. 1 & 9.
6. See T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar - *Pāṇḍyar Varalāgu*. Appe. No. 1, p. 200. The translation given in *E. I.* Vol. XVII. pp. 291-309 makes no mention of it.
7. *E. I.* Vol VI. p. 10.

alliance with the Chōlas, the Kēraḷas and the Pāṇḍyas and defeated the Pallavas. The Kūram plates of Paramēśvaravarman I state that Narasimhavarman I “repeatedly” conquered the Chōlas along with other kings.¹ This information coupled with the fact that the Chōlas had matrimonial connections with the Pāṇḍyas may lead one to doubt whether in the first half of the 7th century the Chōlas had any alliance with the W. Chālukyas against the Pallavas. The veracity of Pulikēśin II’s claim regarding his alliance with the Chōlas and other powers can be considered only when authentic information about the route of his invasion of the Pallava empire is available. Moreover, the hold of the Pallavas on the Chōḷa country during this period appears to have remained undisturbed.² Possibly the Aihole inscription refers to the non-alignment of the three southern powers in the Pallava-Chālukya struggle of this period.

According to some W. Chālukya records³ Vikramāditya I, (c.A.D. 655–680) the son and successor of Pulikēśin II invaded the Pallava empire, captured Kāñchi, marched southwards and encamped at Urāgapura i. e., Uṛaiyūr.⁴ But soon he was put to rout by Paramēśvaravarman I at Peruvaṇanallūr (Lalgudi

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. I. p. 152.
2. See paragraph 2 of *M. E. R.* 1930–31.
3. The Nerur plates of Vijayāditya (I. A. Vol. IX. p. 129); The Sorab grant of Vinayāditya (*I. A.* Vol. XIX. p. 151); The Kendur plates of Kirtivarman II (*E. I.* Vol. IX. pp. 205–06); The Gadval plates of Vikramāditya I (*E. I.* Vol. X. pp. 100–06); and the Savnur plates (*E. I.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 115–116).
4. Dr. Hultzsch’s identification of Urāgapura with Negapatam in the Tanjore district (*E. I.* Vol. X. p. 102) is untenable. See K. A. Nilakanda Sastri *Op. cit.* p. 108.

taluk, Trichinopoly district).¹ Since the W. Chālukya records cited above, describe the Chōlas as the 'enemies' of Vikramāditya, it is not unlikely that the former assisted the Pallava king in vanquishing the W. Chālukya army.

Though the Pāṇḍya king Kōchchadaiyaṇ alias Raṇadhīraṇ, son of Arikēsari Māravarmaṇ is called Śembiyaṇ² and is thought to have maintained supremacy over his Chōla contemporary³ the exact nature of his relations with the Chōlas is not clear. It is known from the Vēlvikkuḍi grant⁴ that Nandivarmaṇ II sustained several defeats at the hands of the Pāṇḍya king Rājasimha I, son of Kōchchadaiyaṇ, and, according to the Udayēndiram plates⁵ was besieged at Nandipura by the Damiḷa (i. e. Tamil) princes. That the Pāṇḍya and Chēra kings assisted by the Koḍumbālūr chiefs laid the siege of Nandipura is practically certain,⁶ though it is not specifically mentioned in the Udayēndiram plates. The role of the Chōlas in the siege is not clear. The Vēlvikkuḍi grant mentions Rājasimha's renovation of the palaces and ramparts of Kūḍal, Vaṇji and Kōḷi i. e. Uṇaiyūr.⁷ If the statement is taken at its face value it would mean that a Chōla prince of Uṇaiyūr was subordinate to the Pāṇḍya king. The conquest of Maḷa-koṅgu by Rājasimha I renders this view possible. The possibility is strengthened by the fact that this Pāṇḍya

1. S. I. I. Vol. II. p. 371.

2. E. I. Vol. XVII. p. 307

3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*. p. 55

4. E. I. Vol. XVII. p. 307.

5. S. I. I. Vol. II. pt. III., p. 372.

6. See E. I. Vol. XIII. Śendalai Inscriptions. pp. 134–149.

7. E. I. Vol. XVII. p. 307.

king had matrimonial connections with the Chōḷas.¹ If the possibility turns out to be a fact, it may be said, that the Chōḷas assisted the Pāṇdyas in the siege of Nandipura. But the Śendalai inscriptions of Śuvarāṇ Māraṇ alias Perumbidugu Muttaraiyaṇ II,² an elder contemporary of Nandivarman II make no mention of the Chōḷas among the enemies conquered by him. Possibly on the arrival of Udayachandra at Nandipura the Chōḷas joined him deserting the Pāṇdyas.

We have already stated that a branch of the Chōḷa dynasty was, during this period, ruling from Paḷaiyārai. There is clear evidence that Nandipura was then a part of Paḷaiyārai.³ Since a part of Paḷaiyārai was called after Nandivarman, it may be presumed that the Chōḷas of Paḷaiyārai were feudatory to him before the siege. But whether they continued to be feudatory to the Pallava king or not, is not known. In other words, the role of the Chōḷas in the siege of Nandipura is not clear, though their participation in it is quite probable. The subsequent re-establishment of Pallava supremacy in the Chōḷa country is borne out by the existence there of some of the records of Nandivarman II⁴.

Some years after the siege of Nandipura the Pallava power experienced another set-back. The Vēḷvikkūḍi grant of Neḍuñjaḍaiyaṇ, son of Rājasimha I, describes him as king of the Chōḷas and mentions his success over the Pallavas at Penṇagaḍam about A. D. 768.⁵ The absence of any reference

1. According to Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar, the sister of Rājasimha I was given in marriage to a Chōḷa prince. (*Pāṇdyar Varalāṅu*, p. 46.)
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 134-149.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. XIII. No. 259.
4. Nos. 33 and 36 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.
5. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. pp. 307-8.

in the record to Pāṇḍya-Chōḷa conflict in this war seems to suggest that the Chōḷas might have thrown in their lot with the Pāṇḍyas on the eve of or sometime before the war.

The Madras Museum plates of the same Pāṇḍya king dated in his 17th year (c. A. D. 782) mention his another remarkable victory over the combined forces of the Kēraḷa, Pallava and Adigamāṇ rulers at several places on the northern bank of the Kāvērī.¹ But the record is silent on the Chōḷas. This seems to indicate that the Chōḷas continued to be the vassals of the Pāṇḍyas and supported the latter in their wars with other powers.

The continuance of Pāṇḍya sway over the Kāvērī region during and after the reign of Neḍuñjaḍaiyaṇ is attested by the absence from that region of Dantivarmaṇ's inscriptions dated after his 16th year and by the existence of several Pāṇḍya inscriptions there.² There appears to be no room for doubt that during this period the Chōḷas paid their allegiance to the Pāṇḍyas.

The accession of Nandivarmaṇ III ushered in another period of Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle. The Kuṇṇāṇḍārkōvil inscription dated in the third year of Nandivarmaṇ III³ perhaps indicates the transitory reassertion of Pallava supremacy in the distant south even before the battle of Teḷḷāru. It seems that before this battle the Pāṇḍyas carried their arms as far as Araśūr on the northern bank of the Peṇṇai in southern Tōṇḍaimaṇḍalam.⁴ But Nandivarmaṇ III's triumph at Teḷḷāru about A. D. 836 checked their progress

1. *I. A.* Vol. XXII, p. 73.

2. e. g. 160 and 37 of 1931.

3. See *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 46.

4. *E. I.* Vol. IX, No. 10, p. 91.

and was soon followed by his reconquest of the Chōḷa country as evidenced by the existence of some of his records in the Chōḷa country.¹ The Tamil work *Nandikkalambakam* mentions Nandivarman III's victories at Paḷaiyārai, Kaḍambūr, Veṇiyālūr Kurukkōṭṭai etc.² It is very probable that the Pallava king's fight at these places was connected with the battle of Teḷḷāru.

Now let us see whether it is possible to say anything about the part played by the Chōḷas in the battle of Teḷḷāru. The Vēlūrpaḷayam plates of Nandivarman III dated in his 6th year mention a Chōḷa king by name Kumarāṅkuśa and the gift of a village made at his request.³ Apparently Kumarāṅkuśa was a feudatory of the Pallava king. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri regards this Chōḷa king as belonging to a separate line of Chōḷas who "form the link connecting the early Cōḷas of the Tamil country and the numerous dynasties of petty chieftains in the Telugu and Karnataka country."⁴ Nevertheless we may regard the Chōḷa king as a Tamil ruler for the inscription comes from a Tamil district and is written in Sanskrit and Tamil. Though his prowess is praised in the record, his martial exploits are not stated. Perhaps he might have fought against the Pāṇḍyas on some earlier occasion. It is not known if he took part in the battle of Teḷḷāru which is mentioned in most of the records of Nandivarman issued from his tenth year.

The Tamil work *Nandikkalambakam* describes how Nandivarman III captured Paḷaiyārai destroying the hostile

1. e. g., *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 56.

2. vv. 19-31.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. II: No. 98.

4. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *The Cōḷas*, p. 104.

armies.¹ As has been already noted Paḷaiyārai was one of the centres of the Chōḷa power during the period under review. Since Nandivarman III is said to have taken Paḷaiyārai after a fight, it seems probable that the Chōḷas of this place had stood by the Pāṇḍyas in their war with the Pallava king. The capture of Paḷaiyārai was doubtless followed by the Chōḷa acknowledgement of Pallava overlordship for the *Nandikkalambakam* describes Nanivarman III as the lord of the Chōḷa country, lord of Uṟaiyūr etc.²

It may be noted in passing that some time after the famous battle of Teḷḷāru the Chōḷas under Vijayālaya took Tanjore from the Muttaraiyars who were probably at that time in alliance with the Pāṇḍyas. The event contributed much to the rise of the Chōḷa power and was responsible for the waning of the Muttaraiya power in the Kāvēri region.

The battle of Teḷḷāru did not put an end to the Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle for supremacy over the Chōḷa country. Some years after that war, Śrīmāra Śrīvallabha, the father of Varaguṇa II, invaded the Chōḷa country, and according to the Siṇṇamaṇṇūr plates, defeated the Chōḷas along with the Pallavas, Gaṅgas, Kaliṅgas and Magadhas.³ It is not known whether after this war the Chōḷas paid allegiance to the Pāṇḍyas or to the Pallavas. Whatever it may be, the Siṇṇamaṇṇūr plates contain the first clear testimony for the Pallava-Chōḷa alliance.

The accession of Nṛipatuṅgavarman, the son and successor of Nandivarman III, was followed by his war with

1. “கூடார், படையாறுசாயப் பழையாறு வென்றான்”

v. 31.

2. *Ibid.* vv. 5 and 44.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. p. 461.

the Pāṇdyas. In the battle of Arichit Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṇ is said to have "burnt a confederation of enemies in a battle on the bank of the Arichit."¹ Though the role of the Chōḷas in this war is not clear from the evidence at our disposal, it is possible that they assisted the Pallava king.

There seems to have been no active hostilities between the Pāṇdyas and the Pallavas for about two decades after this war. During this period the Chōḷas were steadily strengthening themselves. The persistent efforts of the Pāṇdyas to bring the Kāvērī region under their control resulted in the great battle of Śrīpuṇḍriyam about A. D. 880. In that final contest between the Pallavas and the Pāṇdyas the Chōḷas rendered remarkable assistance to their Pallava overlord, Aparājita.² It has been aptly remarked that in this battle the Pallavas owed their success more to the might of their feudatories than to their own.³ The results of the war were far-reaching. The great benefits of the victory were reaped not by the Pallavas but by the Chōḷas whose services in the war earned for them territories far beyond their traditional frontiers.⁴ The disappearance of the danger of Pāṇḍya imperialism which had for some time past been responsible

1. *E. I.* Vol. XVIII. p. 13.

2. *Contra.* T. A. Gopinatha Rao. *E. I.* Vol. XV. p. 49. Mr. Rao thinks that Āditya allied with the Pāṇḍya king Varaguṇa II and defeated and killed Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṇ in the fight at Śrīpuṇḍriyam. Further, he identifies Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṇ with Aparājita. Obviously the identification is baseless and the alliance is highly improbable. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.* p. 118, F. n. 16.

3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.*, p. 110.

4. *Ibid.* p. 118. F. n. 26.

for the effective alliance between the declining Pallavas and the rising Chōḷas now made room for a conflict between them.

Some years after the victory at Śrīpuṇambiyam the relations between the Chōḷas and the Pallavas seem to have become strained in spite of the fact that Āditya I had a Pallava princess for his queen.¹ It seems that at the same time the Muttaraiyars and the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs were steadily coming under Chōḷa control. The immediate cause of Āditya I's attack on the Pallava empire is not known. Yet there is no doubt that it put an end to the Pallava power. The Tiruvalāṅgāḍu plates² and the Kaṇyākumārī inscription³ describe how Āditya conquered Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam killing Aparājita in a great fight. Many similar cases of overmighty feudatories superseding their paramount powers are found in Indian history. The early Kadambas were overthrown by their vassals, the W. Chāḷukyas, the latter by their feudatories, the Rāshtrakūṭas and the Rāshtrakūṭas by their Chāḷukya feudatories.

In conclusion it may be said that on some occasions the Chōḷas of the Tamil country assisted the Pallavas in their campaigns against the W. Chāḷukyas and Pāṇḍyas and on some other occasions made common cause with the Pāṇḍyas against the Pallavas. Though the Pallava power was brought to a close by the Chōḷas, they were not wholly responsible for it for frequent wars on distant fronts greatly exhausted the resources of the Pallava empire. That apart, the Pallavas lost the support of almost all their feudatories even before Āditya I's invasion of the Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. The Bāṇas

1. Paragraph 2 of *M. E. R.* 1927-28.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 205. v. 49.

3. *T. A. S.* Vol. III. No. 34. v. 55.

became independent of the Pallava power about A.D. 888. The Muttaraiyars, the W. Gaṅgas and the Kōḍumbāḷūr chiefs seem to have come under Chōḷa influence. The limited area within which Aparājita's inscriptions are found indicates the speedy decline of the Pallava power.¹ There can be, therefore, no wonder that Āditya I compassed the ruin of the Pallava power at one blow.

Religion :

The Pallava period witnessed great religious movements in the Tamil country in general and in the Chōḷa country in particular. All the important religions of the day had their zealous votaries there. Though the Chōḷas followed Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism, they tolerated the protestant faiths viz., Jainism and Buddhism.

Saivism :

It is significant that a great majority of the sixty three Nāyaṇārs (i. e., Śaiva saints) belonged to the Chōḷa country.² It is beyond the scope of the work to give any detailed account of them. Nevertheless, something may be said about some of them. St. Sambandar, the first and foremost of the Dēvāram trio, was a native of Śīrkāḷi (Tanjore district). He espoused the cause of Śaivism throughout the Tamil country and was, to a considerable extent, responsible for the fall of Jainism and Buddhism from their proud position in the Tamil country. His majestic hymns and extensive pilgrimages greatly helped the growth of Śaivism. Śīruttonḍar another celebrated Śaiva saint, came from Tiruchcheṅgāṭṭāṅkuḍi

1. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.*, p. 118. F. n. 26.

2. Dr. M. Rajamanikkam. *Op. cit.* Appe. No. VI.
pp. 352-353.

(Tanjore district) and, according to the *Periyapurāṇam*, led the Pallava expedition to Vātāpi, the W. Chālukya capital. Maṇakkasāra and Kalikkāmar, two other Nāyanārs, are described by the same work as Chōḷa generals. It is also known from the *Periyapurāṇam* that when St. Appar visited the Sivā temple at Paḷaiyārai, the Jains of the place hid the *Sivaliṅga* and that the Chōḷa king (of Paḷaiyārai) intervened in the matter and had the *liṅga* restored to its original place. St. Sundarar is said in the same work to have been received at Madura by a Chōḷa prince along with Pāṇḍya and Chēra kings.¹ The Velūrpālayam plates of Nandivarman III dated in his 6th year state that at the request of Kumarāṅkuśa, a Chōḷa prince, the village of Tirukkāṭṭuppaḷi was granted to the temple of Yājñeśvara at the same place.² The Chōḷa king Vijayālaya is known to have erected a temple in Tanjore for goddess Durgā.³ An inscription of Āditya I from Tiruppaḷaṇam (Tanjore district) dated in his 23rd year states that his queen who was of Pallava descent made a gift for a lamp to the god of Tiruppaḷaṇam.⁴ A similar gift was made by

1. “சேரமான் தோழருமச் சேர்பிரானும் பணிப்பூண்,
ஆரமார்பரை மதுரை ஆலவாயினில் வணங்க,
வாரமா வந்தணைய வழதியார் மனக்காதல்,
கூரமாநகர் கோடித் தெதிர்கொண்டு கொடுப்புக்கார்.”
“தென்னவர்கோன் மகளாரைத் திருவேட்டு முன்னரே
தொன்மதுரை நகரின்கண் இனிதிருந்த சோழனார்,
அன்னவர்கள் உடன்கூட அணையவ வருங்கூடி,
மன்னுதிரு ஆலவாய் மணிக்கோயில் வந்தணைந்தார்”
vv. 91 and 92 of Kaḷariggaṇiṭṭar purāṇam.

2. S. I. I. Vol. II. pt. V. No. 98.

3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.*, p. 116.

4. 161 of 1928.

the same queen to the Śiva temple at Tiruchchatturai (Tanjore taluk).¹

It is worthy of note that there were many Śaiva *maṭhas* in the Chōḷa country during the Pallava period. The *maṭhas* at Tirumarukal, Tiruvārūr, Tiruvīḷimiḷalai, Vēdāraṇyam, Śīrkāḷi, Tiruppukalūr and Tirukkaḍavūr were, according to the *Periyapurāṇam*, visited by St. Sambandar.

Vaiṣṇavism :

As regards Vaiṣṇavism it was professed by some Chōḷa rulers and was in general patronised by all. According to the *Guruparambarāprabāvam*, a late Vaiṣṇava work, Tondaraḍippoḍi Āḷvār, Tiruppāṇ Āḷvār and Tirumaṅgai Āḷvār hailed from the Chōḷa country. Tirumaṅgai Āḷvār who belonged to a predatory class began his life as a Chōḷa general; turned against his master, became a freebooter and looted the Buddhist Vihāra at Negapatam. His most significant contribution to the *Nālāyiraprabandham* is the *Periyatirumōḷi*.

Tondaraḍippoḍi Āḷvār, also known as Vipranārāyaṇa lived for a time with Dēvadēvi, a courtesan, got into trouble, but was finally saved by Lord Raṅganātha. *Tirumālai* and *Tiruppallēḷuchchi* are his contribution to the *Nālāyiraprabandham*.

Tiruppāṇ Āḷvār came of the lowest caste but his devotion to Lord Raṅganātha was so great that he asked his Brāhmaṇ priest to bring the devotee to his presence. The *Nālāyiraprabandham* contains hymns - only 10 stanzas -, of this Āḷvār.

1. No. 351 of S. I. I. Vol. XIII.

Tonḍaraḍipppoḍi Ālvār and Tiruppāṇ Ālvār were contemporaries of Tirumaṅgai Ālvār who was a contemporary of Nandivarman II.¹

A Chōḷa king of Uṟaiyūr by name Dharmavarman is described in the *Guruparambarāprabāvam* as the father of the well-known Uṟaiyūr-Nāchchiyār² “who declined to marry a mortal, and insisted successfully on her union with Lord Ranganātha.”³ An inscription of Pallava Dantivarman from Tiruchchāṇūr (Chandragiri taluk, Chittoor district) dated in his 51st year records the gift of gold by the Chōḷa king Ulakapperumāṇār of the Chōḷa country to the Viṣṇu temple of that place.⁴ It appears that the Chōḷas of this period did not erect any temple ‘that could survive the effects of time.’⁵

Jainism :

Attention has already been drawn to the mention in the *Periyapurāṇam* of the existence at Paḷaiyārai of Jains. The puranic testimony is confirmed by a poem in *Yāpparuṅgalam*

1. See *The Classical Age*. p. 263.

2. The *Guruparambarāprabāvam* – *Tiruppāṇ Ālvār Vaibavam*.

3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op. cit.* p. 106.

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 43; 262 of 1904.

5. Mr. V. Venkayya observes: “Like the W. Cāḷukyas during the period of Rāṣṭrakūṭa supremacy, the Eastern Cāḷukyas during the period of interregnum between A. D. 972 and 999 and the Pāṇḍyas at the time of Cōḷa supremacy, the Cōḷas at the time of which we are now speaking, probably did nothing worthy of permanent record and were apparently not in a position to erect any monuments that could survive the effects of time.” (*A. S. I.* 1905–6), p. 178.

(*virutti*).¹ Tiruchchirāpaḷḷi, as the suffix of the name seems to suggest, was originally a Jain centre, but probably with Mahēndravarmān's conversion to Śaivism the influence of the Jains of that place began to wane.² Other centres of Jainism in the Chōḷa country have been dealt with in the chapter on the Muttaraiyars.

Buddhism :

It is known from the *Periyapurāṇam* that Bōdhi māṅgai³ was a great seat of Buddhist learning, that St. Sambandar was challenged by the Buddhists of that place, that he vanquished them in a theological disputation and that on their defeat they embraced Śaivism. According to the *Guruparambarā-prabāvam*, there was a Buddhist vihāra at Negapatam in the time of Tirumaṅgai Āḷvār. Inscriptions of the Greater Chōḷas

1. “ஏறுயர் கொடியி னிருவிசம்பதிரு மெறிமுகச்
சதீர்கட ற்ருளை,
வீறுயர் மணிக்கால் வெண்குடையோங்கு
தண்டுறையின் பழையாற்று,
மாறடு படிவ மதியுறுந் தருண மாதவ னேதமில் பாதம்,
வீறடு கதிக ளாழ்கதி வீழ விளங்கிய
விழுத்துணையாமே.”

S. Bavanandam Pillai's edition (1916) p. 393. Prof. T. P. Meenakshisundaram and Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar take “ஏறுயர்கொடி” to mean the Pallava flag (*J. A. U. Vol. XVI. p. 32*).

2. *Sentami*. Vol. 45. (1947-48) pp. 77-82. Also see paragraph 3 of *M. E. R.* 1937-38.
3. “Situated on the Koradachcheri-Mannarkudi road in the Tanjore district;” K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op. cit.* p. 108. F. n. 6.

point to such a possibility.¹ Palaiyārai is also known to have been a Buddhist centre during the Pallava period.²

The data given above go to prove that the rapid progress of Saivism and Vaishnavism during the Pallava period did not result in the complete extinction in the Chōla country of Jainism and Buddhism. But their great influence in the Chōla country was gone for ever. The religious policy of the Chōlas of this period was, to some extent, responsible for such a change.

1. *Ibid.* pp. 656-7.

2. முழங்கு களியாணை மூரிக் கடற்படை முறிதார் மன்னன்,
வழங்குமிடமெல்லாம் தன்புகழே போக்கிய வைவேல்
விண்ணன்,

செழுந்தண் பழசையுட் சிறந்து நாளுஞ்செய,
எழுந்தசேதி கத்துளிருந்த அண்ணலடி,
விழுந்தண்பூ மலர்களால் வியந்துநா ளுந்தொழத்,
தொடர்ந்து நின்றவ்வினை துறந்துபோ மாலரோ.”

Yāpparungalam(virutti)—quoted in *J.A.U.* Vol. XVI. p. 32. Prof. T. P. Minakshisundaram and Mr. T.V. Sadasiva Pandarathar think that ‘பழசை’ is a contraction of Palaiyārai and that ‘விண்ணன்’ was probably a Chōla feudatory of the Pallavas. (*Ibid.*).

THE CHŌLAS OF RĒNĀṆḌU (c. A. D. 545 – c. 630)

The history of the Chōlas of Rēnāṇḍu during the period under review is not so obscure as that of the Chōlas of the Tamil country. Besides a large number of stone records we have some copper-plate records of these Chōlas. There is, however, much uncertainty about their chronology and, to some extent, genealogy.

As regards Rēnāṇḍu Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri states that it "comprised the tract of land lying along the Kunderu river in the Cuddapah and Karnūl districts,"¹ though a slightly different view is expressed by the same historian and Mr. M Venkataramayya in *E. I.* Vol. XXVII (1947) p. 225. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya thinks that Rēnāṇḍu comprised the whole of the Cuddapah district.² Mr. V. Venkayya holds that the south-west of the Anantapur district was part of the Rēnāṇḍu country.³ Since most of the records of the Chōlas of Rēnāṇḍu come from the Jammalamadugu, Proddatur, Kamalapuram, Pulivendla and Razampeta taluks of the Cuddapah district, it is certain that a major portion of the district was in the Rēnāṇḍu country. Hiuen Tsang's description of Chu-li-ya i. e., the kingdom of the Chōlas, makes it clear that the forest region of the Kurnool district was a part of Rēnāṇḍu.⁴ The identification of Chirpali, the capital of

1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op. cit.*, p. 103.

2. *M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929. p. 13.

3. *A. S. I.* 1905–06. p. 175.

4. *M. E. R.* 1906, paragraph 6.

Puṇyakumāra, with Chippili in the Madanapalle taluk of the Chittoor district¹ makes it probable that portions of this district also formed part of Rēnāṇḍu. It is quite doubtful whether Rēnāṇḍu included any part of the Kolar or Anantapur district.

A word also about the origin of these Chōḷas will not be out of place here. Mr. V. Venkayya thinks that portions of the Kurnool and Cuddapah districts formed part of the dominions of Karikāla, that either the expansion of the W. Chāḷukyas under Pulikēśin II or the aggression of the Pallavas on an earlier occasion must have broken up the power of the Chōḷas and that in consequence of it, the Chōḷa power in the Telugu country was confined to a small territory known as Rēnāṇḍu.² On the other hand Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri rejects this view and states that "the Pallava dominion of the Simhavishṇu line may have been the medium through which the drift of the Cōḷas to the north took place."³ Another suggestion made by the same historian and Mr. M. Venkataramayya on an earlier occasion is that the migration of the Chōḷas to the Telugu country was "part of a general northward movement caused by the conditions following upon the disturbances due to the Gupta raid into Eastern Deccan."⁴ All these views are apparently based on uncertain presumptions. As far as available evidence is concerned there is no indication that the Chōḷas established their rule in the Telugu country before the 5th century A. D. What appears to be probable is that the establishment of Kaḷabhra rule at Kāverippūmpattinam referred to in the

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 225.

2. *A. S. I.* 1905-6, p. 175, F. n. 8.

3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op. cit.*, p. 107, F. n. 1.

4. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 247.

Vinayavinicchaya of Buddhadatta (5th century A. D.) caused the migration to the Telugu country of a branch of the Chōḷa dynasty.¹ Deprived of their traditional territory the Chōḷas sought their fortune in the far off northern region and eventually acknowledged the supremacy of the Pallavas.

Nandivarman (c. A. D. 540– c. 565.)

Nandivarman, the great-grandfather of Puṇyakumāra, mentioned in the Mālēpāḍu² and Dommara-Nandyāla plates³ is the first known Chōḷa king of Rēnāṇḍu. Since he is named after the Pallava king, Nandivarman I, it may be surmised that he was a feudatory of that Pallava king who may be assigned to the first half of the 6th century A. D.⁴ There seems to be no difficulty in presuming that the father of this Chōḷa king was a subordinate of the Pallavas and hence named his son after a Pallava king.⁵ Little is known of the

1. See Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar *Commemoration Volume*. p. 243.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 339.

3. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 274.

4. See *Ibid.*, p. 250–51.

5. Writing on the Mālēpāḍu plates Mr. H. Krishna Sastri expresses “the possibility of some undefined relationship, political or otherwise, that may have existed between the Chōḷas of the Cuddapah district and the Pallavas of Kāñchi” (*E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 341). The relationship is not too obscure to define. The ancient practice of feudatories assuming the names and titles of their overlords makes it easy to understand the nature of early Telugu Chōḷa-Pallava connections. The striking similarity in the names and titles of the early Telugu Chōḷas and the Pallavas clearly indicates the subordination of the former to the latter. There seems to have been no matrimonial alliance between the two dynasties.

services of this Chōḷa king to the Pallavas. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar suggests that either this Chōḷa king or his son, Śundarananda may be identified with Nandachōḷa whose benefactions to the Viṣṇu temple at Śrīraṅgam are noted in the Tamil Vaishṇava work, *Kōyiloḷu*.¹ This suggestion is very doubtful.

Simhavishṇu (c. A. D. 565 – c. 575)

Nandivarman had three sons² and was succeeded by the eldest of them, Simhavishṇu, obviously named after the Pallava king Simhavishṇu (c. A. D. 575–c. 600). Nothing is known about the political activities of this Chōḷa king.

Dhaṇaṇjayavarman (c. A. D. 585–c. 595)

The order of succession after the Chōḷa king Simhavishṇu is not clear though it is possible that he was followed by his two brothers in succession.³ Dhaṇaṇjayavarman, the youngest brother of Simhavishṇu, figures in an inscription from Kalamallā (Kamalapuram taluk, Cuddapah district).⁴ Another inscription from Erraguḍipāḍu (the same taluk) is also assigned to this king.⁵ The latter record mentions Eriḱal Mutturāju and Vallava Dukarāju. Eriḱal Mutturāju is regarded as identical with Dhaṇaṇjayavarman and

-
1. *His. Sk. An. Dek.* p. 207.
 2. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 339 and *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 274.
 3. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 224.
 4. *Ibid.* pp. 221–22.
 5. *Ibid.* pp. 225–226.

Vallava Dukarājulu is taken to be a Pallava prince of Kāñchi, probably Simhavishṇu.¹

Mahēndravarmaṇ (c. A. D. 595– c. 620).

Dhaṇaṇjaya-varmaṇ was followed by his son Mahēndra-varmaṇ I. The Mālēpāḍu plates of Puṇyakumāra state that Mahēndravarmaṇ acquired the title 'Chōḷa Mahārāja' and was the lord of Pāṇḍya, Chōḷa and Kēraḷa countries.² Two inscriptions from Kamalapuram taluk are assigned to this king.³ It is held by Dr. N. Venkatramanayya that Mahēndravarmaṇ's assumption of the title Chōḷa Mahārāja indicates his assertion of independence.⁴ But the title Mahārāja was generally assumed by powerful feudatories besides independent kings. For instance, Kumarāṅkusa, a Chōḷa vassal of Nandivarmaṇ III, is called Chōḷa Mahārāja in the Vēlūrpaḷayam plates.⁵ Therefore Mahēndravarmaṇ's title, Chōḷa Mahārāja, need not necessarily indicate his independent status. On the other hand his name and his contemporaneity with Pallava Mahēndravarmaṇ I make it certain that he was a feudatory of the Pallava king.⁶ As this Chōḷa king is called "the lord of Pāṇḍya, Chōḷa and Kēraḷa

1. *Ibid.* p. 227. A certain Dhaṇaṇjaya-varmaṇ figures in some Kannaḍa records from the Tumkur district - *E. C.* Vol. XII. Mi. 97 and 100). He should be different from Dhaṇaṇjaya-varmaṇ of Rēnāṇḍu for he is assigned to the 8th century A. D. See *E. C.* Vol. XII. Intro. p. 7.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 339.

3. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 228–230.

4. *M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929. p. 17.

5. *S. I. I.* Vol. II, pt. V. No. 98, L. 47.

6. See *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 251.

countries"¹ it is inferred that he probably helped the Pallava king Simhavishṇu in his southern campaigns.² If this inference is accepted, it may be said that while he was crown-prince, the Chōḷa king assisted the Pallava king against the southern powers.

Gaṇamudita (c. A. D. 620- c. 625).

The Chōḷa king Mahēndravarmaṇ I had two sons, Gaṇamudita and Puṇyakumāra. Gaṇamudita, the elder, appears to have ruled only for a short period. The name Gaṇamudita is said to have been modelled on Gaṇabhara, a title of Pallava Mahēndravarmaṇ I.³ If this view is accepted, it follows then that Gaṇamudita was named after one of the titles of his Pallava contemporary. It may be noted that this view is in harmony with the date given here for Gaṇamudita.

Puṇyakumāra (c. A. D. 625- c. 655)

Gaṇamudita was succeeded by his brother Puṇyakumāra. There is difference of opinion among scholars in regard to the date of Puṇyakumāra. Mr. H. Krishna Sastri refers to the Mālēpāḍu plates of this king to the end of the 8th century A. D. on scriptal grounds.⁴ Mr. H. K. Narasimhasvami assigns the Dommara-Nandyāla plates issued by the same king in his 10th year i. e., five years after the Mālēpāḍu plates, to the middle of the 8th century A. D.⁵ On the other hand

1. *E. I.*, Vol. XI. p. 339.

2. *E. I.* XXVII. p. 251. *Contra. J. A. H. R. S.* Vol. VII. (1933) p. 224.

3. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 251.

4. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 344.

5. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 270.

Dr. N. Venkataramanayya states that the Mālēpāḍu plates belong to the middle of the 7th century.¹ On scriptal grounds the stone inscriptions of Puṇyakumāra are assigned by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and Mr. M. Venkataramayya to the first half of the 7th century.² Dr. P. Sreenivasachari also holds the same view.³ Of these views Dr. N. Venkataramanayya's is most probable and is supported by other considerations. It has been accepted even by H. Krishna Sastri that "the adoption by Puṇyakumāra and his ancestors of titles and names which were current among Pallava kings of Simhavishṇu line, makes it probable that they were either the subordinates of the Pallavas or succeeded them politically."⁴ It must be noted that in case a feudatory wished to assume the name or title of the supreme dynasty, he assumed for the most part the name or title of his contemporary overlord and not the name or title of his overlord's ancestors. It was in keeping with this practice that the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu assumed the names and titles of their Pallava masters. In short, the names and titles of these Chōḷa rulers furnish a clue for determining their chronology. Thus, some of the titles of Puṇyakumāra which are akin to those of Pallava Mahēndravarman I,⁵ show that he was a contemporary - perhaps a younger contemporary, and a feudatory of the

-
1. *M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929, p. 18.
 2. *E. I.* Vol XXVII. pp. 230-232.
 3. *J. I. H.* Vol. XV. p. 37.
 4. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 344.
 5. Puṇyakumāra's titles Mārdavachitta and Madanavilāsa "indicate some apparent affinity to Mattavilāsa and Vichitrachitta, the recognised *birudas* of (Pallava) Mahēndravarman I" - *E. I.* XI. p. 341. See also H. Krishna Sastri's view on the name of the Chōḷa king Mahēndravarman I - *Ibid.*

Pallava king.¹ All these facts go to prove that Krishna Sastri's date for Puṇyakumāra is untenable.

Though Puṇyakumāra began his career as a subordinate of the Pallavas, he did not continue to be so to the end. In the Rāmēśvaram pillar inscription he bears the title Pṛithivī-vallabha and his queen bears the name Vasantipōṛi Chōḷa-mahādēvi.² The title Pṛithivīvallabha was borne by the Chāḷukyas of Vātāpi.³ As regards Vasantipōṛi it is said that the suffix of her name, pōṛi, indicates her connections with the Chāḷukya dynasty of Vātāpi.⁴ In other words the word Pōṛi is held to be peculiar to the royal ladies of Vātāpi.⁵ Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has shown the improbability of Vasantipōṛi belonging to Pōṛi family whose records⁶ are found in the Chittoor district.⁷ It is therefore probable that Puṇyakumāra had a Chāḷukya princess for his queen. His assumption of the Chāḷukya title Pṛithivīvallabha reinforces the view. The early Telugu Chōḷa - W. Chāḷukya matrimonial

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, p. 251. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, however, holds that Puṇyakumāra was an independent king and that his assumption of titles similar to those of Pallava Mahēndravarmaṇ I was due to his admiration for the latter (*M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929, p. 17). This is unconvincing.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, pp. 234-235; 384 of 1904.

3. See *The Classical Age*. pp. 235, 242 and 243.

4. *M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929, p. 18.

5. *Ibid.* The examples given by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya support the view. The names of Vijayamahādēvi Pōṛi, queen of Chandraditya, son of Pulikēśin II, and Pṛithivīpōṛi, daughter of the Eastern Chāḷukya king Maṅgi Mahārāja are worthy of note.

6. e. g., 307 and 329 of 1922.

7. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, p. 234.

alliance must have taken place sometime before the 5th year of Puṇyakumāra.¹ The alliance does not appear to have been preceded by any war as the Aihoḷe inscription of Pulikēśin II makes no mention of any conflict between the two powers. Puṇyakumāra's subordinate alliance with the W. Chālukyas was not immediately followed by his abandonment of such titles which indicate his connections with the Pallavas.²

The Chōḷa king's part in the Pallava - W. Chālukya contest of his period is not clear. But it is possible that he fought on the side of the Chālukyas in some of the campaigns. Of the three places where Pallava Narasimhavarman I, triumphed over Pulikēśin II, Maṇimaṅgalam is situated near Kāñchī; Sūramāra may be identified with Sūramāla in the Kalahasti division of the Chittoor district; Pariyaḷa may be identified with Paidēla in the Proddatur taluk of the Cuddapah district.³ The identification of the last two places suggests that Rēnāṇḍu was also the scene of Pallava - W. Chālukya conflict.

The names of certain villages in the Cuddapah district seem to indicate that the Rēnāṇḍu country or part of it was occupied by the Pallavas under Narasimhavarman I.⁴ It is untenable to say that the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu were independent during this period when the Pallavas and the W. Chālukyas were engaged in a fierce struggle.⁵ An inscription from

-
1. The Rāmēśvaram pillar inscription is dated in the 5th year Puṇyakumāra.
 2. See The Dombara-Nandyāla Plates of Puṇyakumāra, *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 276.
 3. *J. I. H.* Vol. XV. p. 40.
 4. Māmillapaḷḷi and three villages of the name Narasimhapuram in the Badvel taluk and a village of the same name in the Rajampet taluk are worthy of note.
 5. *Contra.* *J. A. H. R. S.* Vol. VII, p. 225-26.

Tippalūru (Kamalapuram taluk) dated in the first year of W. Chālukya Vikramāditya Satyāśraya records a grant of Pannāsa at Maṭṭalūru to God Veṅgipāra-Īśvara made by Vāmbuḷu while Pōrmukharāma was ruling over Bānarāja's territory bounded by the Pennā river.¹ Pōrmukharāma of this record is doubtless identical with Puṇyakumāra who alone in his dynasty had that surname. As regards Vikramāditya we come across two monarchs of the same name in the W. Chālukya dynasty one in the 7th century and the other in the 8th century. Both of them had the title Satyāśraya.² On scriptal grounds Vikramāditya of the inscription is identified with Vikramāditya II of the 8th century.³ But, as we have seen, it is not possible to assign Puṇyakumāra to the 8th century. Therefore Vikramāditya of this record must be identified with Vikramāditya I (son and successor of Pulikēśin II) who ruled in the latter half of the 7th century. The record makes it clear that Puṇyakumāra was a subordinate of W. Chālukyas and that his reign lasted till at least the first regnal year of W. Chālukya Vikramāditya I i. e., about A. D. 655. Another thing to be noted here is that Puṇyakumāra exercised his sway over Bānarāja's territory bounded by the Pennā - i. e., Pennār river. The establishment of Puṇyakumāra's rule over the Bāna territory was perhaps the result of Bāna subordination to the W. Chālukyas. As regards the successors of Puṇyakumāra they were most probably the subordinates of the W. Chālukyas.

It is not known whether the descendants of Sundaranda, the second son of the Chōla king Nandivarman, had any contact with the Pallavas of Kāñchi.

1. 284 of 1937-38.

2. *The Classical Age*. pp. 242 and 247.

3. Paragraph 15 of *M. E. R.* 1937-38.

It is not unlikely that the subordination of the Chōlas of Rēnāṇḍu was of considerable assistance to the consolidation and rise of the Pallava power in the time of Simhavishṇu. But their subordinate alliance with the Chālukyas of Vātāpi in the first half of the 7th century greatly weakened the Pallavas. The Pallavas lost the powerful support of the Chōlas of Rēnāṇḍu once for all. Like the latter, the Bāṇas whose territory was adjacent to Rēnāṇḍu threw in their lot with the W. Chālukyas. It was only in the reign of Nandivarman II that we again find the Bāṇas figuring as the allies of the Pallavas. The Pro-W. Chālukya policy of the two feudatory dynasties facilitated the frequent incursions of the W. Chālukyas into the heart of the Pallava empire.

Jainism :

It is not possible to give any detailed account of the cultural role of the Chōlas of Rēnāṇḍu in the Pallava empire for the available evidences relating to this aspect are scanty. The account of Hiuen Tsang states that the people of Chu-li-ya (i. e., the Chōla country) were believers in the Tirthikas (i. e., Tirthaṅkaras), that Digambara Jains were popular and that there were several tens of Deva temples in the country.¹ The existence of Jainism in the Rēnāṇḍu country is also borne out by epigraphical evidence. A Sanskrit inscription found on the hill at Panikēlapāḍu in the Jammalamadugu taluk (Cuddapah district) states that the excellent teacher Vṛishabha who was cloud to the crops namely the righteous (Bhavyas) and who was an unshakable rock to his opponents in discourse, lived on this hill.² As

-
1. Thomas Waters – *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*.
Vol. II, p. 224.
 2. 401 of 1940-41.

the term Bhavyas is generally applied to the Jains, Vṛishabha may be taken to be a Jain sage.¹ The conclusion is confirmed by another record. A Kannaḍa inscription from the Chik-Ballapur taluk of the Kolar district describes a certain Vṛishabha as "the most excellent of the Jainas".² It is certain that Vṛishabha of the latter record is identical with his namesake mentioned in the former record. The probable date given by L. Rice for Vṛishabha is A. D. 750. But, since the script of the former inscription is considered to be assignable to the 7th century the Jain sage may have lived in that period.³

Buddhism ;

The existence of Buddhism in the Rēnāṇḍu country is borne out by the account of Hiuen Tsang. But at the time of the Chinese pilgrim's visit, Buddhism was declining in Rēnāṇḍu. There were several Buddhist monasteries. But all of them "were in ruins, and only some of them had Brethren."⁴

Saivism and Vaishṇavism :

Though it is certain that Saivism and Vaishṇavism must have large number of followers in the Rēnāṇḍu country, much information is not available in respect of them. The Rāmēśvaram Pillar inscription of Puṇyakumāra⁵ refers to a Śiva temple (the temple of Vasantiśvara) at Tārumuṇṇi which

1. Paragraph 107 of *M. E. R.* 1939-43.

2. *E. C.* Vol. X. Chik-Ball. No. 29.

3. Paragraph 107 of *M. E. R.* 1939-43.

4. Thomas Waters - *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India.*
Vol. II, p. 224.

5. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, p. 234.

was endowed with two gardens by his queen. It is not known whether the temple was built before or after his alliance with the W. Chāḷukyas.

Patronage of Learning :

The Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu were in general noted for learning and patronage of learning. The Chōḷa king Mahendra-varmaṇ I is described in the Mālēpāḍu plates as having been "well versed in grammar and other sciences."¹ Religious learning was much encouraged and a number of inscriptions record gifts of lands and even villages to pious scholars.² It is interesting to note that these Chōḷas patronised Telugu and Sanskrit. Most of their earlier records are in Telugu and are very valuable to students of Philology. Some of their copper-plate records like the Mālēpāḍu and Dommara-Nandyāla plates are in Sanskrit prose and verse.

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 339.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, p. 220-232.

VI

THE ADIGAMĀNS (c. A. D. 550 – c. 880)

The history of the Adigamāns of Koṅgu is a long but chequered one.¹ The Śaṅgam works *Puṇanāṇṇūru*² and *Aganāṇṇūru*³ contain poems composed in praise of Adiyamāṇ Neḍumāṇ Añji, a contemporary of the celebrated poetess Avvaiyār.⁴ Tagaḍūr, now known as Dharmapuri (Salem district) was the capital of the Adigamāns. It is not clearly known whether the Adigamāns ruled over a part or the whole of the Koṅgu country.⁵

The *Periyapurāṇam* of Sēkkiṭṭar describes at some length a fight between the Chōḷa king Pugaḷ Chōḷa and a certain Adigamāṇ ruler.⁶ The Chōḷa king who is described as the

-
1. The word Adigamāṇ appears to have been the dynastic name. It was also known as Adigamāṇ, Adhiyamāṇ and Adigaṇ.
 2. Poems 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, 231, 232 and 235.
 3. Poems 162 and 352.
 4. It may be noted that Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar's identification of Satiyaputa with an Adigamāṇ ruler of Tagaḍūr is supported by T. Burrow (B. S. O. A. S. Vol. XII, pt. I. p. 475).
 5. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri holds the former view (*The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom* p. 62) and Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar the latter view. (*Pāṇḍyar Varalāru* p. 52).
 6. *Pugaḷchōḷa Nāyaṇār Purāṇam*.

overlord of the Adigamāṇ chief is assigned to a period between A. D. 300 and 500.¹ We do not know whether this Adigamāṇ chief had any relations with the Pallavas.

According to some Kannaḍa inscriptions Durvinīta who is assigned to the period c. A. D. 540 – c. 600² triumphed over a certain Kāḍuveṭṭi,³ and his little son assumed the “Koṅgaṇi crown from the people of Kāḍuveṭṭi.”⁴ ‘Koṅgaṇi crown’ is taken to mean the Koṅgu crown i. e., the rule of the Koṅgu country.⁵ Kāḍuveṭṭi apparently refers to the Pallava king. If these statements are taken at their face value, they would mean that before the accession of Durvinīta, the Koṅgu country was under Pallava supremacy. But no indication of it is seen in the records of the early Pallavas. Nevertheless, it is very probable that Durvinīta conquered the Koṅgu country. An inscription from Dod-Ballapur taluk⁶ mentions his successful campaigns in the Salem and Coimbatore districts.⁷ But, before long, the Koṅgu country passed into the hands of the Pallavas.⁸

According to the Kaśākkuḍi plates of Nandivarman II, Simhavishṇu (c. A. D. 575 – c. 600), the father of

-
1. Dr. M. Rajamanikkam *Op. cit.* p. 94.
 2. *The Classical Age*, p. 269.
 3. *E. C.* Vol. VI. Intro. p. 6.
 4. *Ibid.* Cm. 50.
 5. M. V. Krishna Rao. *Op. cit.* p. 37.
 6. *E. C.* Vol. IX. D. B. No. 68.
 7. *Ibid.* p. 3. F.n. No. 1.
 8. The Tamil work Koṅgudēsarājakkal which professes to give an account of the rulers of Koṅgu mentions the Raṭṭas among the earlier dynasties that ruled over Koṅgu. But little is known of the relations between the Raṭṭas and the Adigamāṇs.

Mahēndravarmaṇ, conquered a Mālava king.¹ The Mālava king mentioned in the record, is no doubt, the king of the Maḷavas who were well-known for their valour. According to Mr. K. S. Vaidyanathan Maḷanāḍu, the territory of the Maḷavas lay in between the Chōḷa and Koṅgu countries and Maḷa-Koṅgu, a part of Maḷanāḍu included the Kollimalais and its neighbourhood in the Namakkal taluk of the Salem district.² That even as early as the Saṅgam period the Maḷavas were under the Adigamāṇs is clear from the *Puṇāṇṇūru*.³

The Namakkal inscription⁴ which mentions Atiyendra Viṣṇugriha besides the titles of Mahēndravarmaṇ I indicates that the Adigamāṇs continued to exercise their control over the Maḷavas in the first half of the 7th century. There can, therefore, be no difficulty in identifying the Mālava king mentioned in the Kaṣākkudi plates with an Adigamāṇ ruler.

The Namakkal inscription cited above⁵ mentions the titles Nayapara, Prakṛitipriya, Naravā(hana), Utpalakarnika and Udārachitta. Apparently the titles are those of Pallava Mahēndravarmaṇ I and indicate Pallava supremacy over the Maḷavas. As we have no evidence for thinking that Mahēndravarmaṇ conquered a Mālava king we may very well conclude that the subjugation of Maḷavas under the Adigamāṇs was accomplished by Simhavishṇu.⁶

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. II., pt. 3, p. 356; v. 20.

2. *Q.J.M.S. Culture and Heritage* Number 1956. pp. 225-27.

3. v. 88; Also see Dr. M. Arokiaswamy - *The Koṅgu Country*.
P. H.

4. 7 of 1906.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Contra.* Dr. M. Rajamanikkam - *Pallavar Varalāgu*.
p. 83, F.n.

It is not unlikely that Simhaviṣṇu's conquest of the Maḷavas was followed by his conquest of the Chōḷa country. The order in which the Kaṣākkuḍi plates mention Simhaviṣṇu's achievements seems to render this view possible. But the fact that the plates belong to a much later period cannot be overlooked.

Very little is known of the role of the Adigamāṇs in the Pallava-Chālukya wars of the seventh and eighth centuries. It is not now possible to say how far the subordination of the Adigamāṇs to the Pallavas in the seventh century was responsible for the absence of any serious trouble to the Pallava empire from the W. Gaṅga side.

The proximity of the Koṅgu country to the Pāṇḍya, Pallava and W. Gaṅga kingdoms gave it a high strategic importance in the eighth century when the three powers were engaged in intermittent wars with one another. The Pāṇḍya incursions into Koṅgu seem to have begun in the reign of Kōchchadaḷayan Raṇadhīraṇ (c. A. D. 670 – c. 710) as he is described in the Vēlvikkūḍi plates as Koṅgarkōmāṇ i. e., lord of the Koṅgas.¹ According to the same record his son Māra-varmaṇ Rājasimha I (c. A. D. 710 – c. 765) subdued Maḷa-koṅgam, worshipped the God Paśupati at Pāṇḍikkoḍumuḍi and presented heaps of gold and jewels to it.² From this it is clear that Pāṇḍya conquests in Koṅgu extended up to Koḍumuḍi (Erode taluk, Coimbatore district). Maḷakoṅgam or Maḷakoṅgu was, as we have noted above, a division of the Koṅgu country.³ The Vēlvikkūḍi grant states that Pāṇḍya

1. *E. I.* Vol. XVII, p. 307.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Hist. Sk. An. Dek.* p. 131. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar states that Maḷakoṅgu was probably the eastern division (of Koṅgu) which extended eastwards from Karur.

Rājasimha contracted relationship with the W. Gaṅgas.¹ This incident did not in any way bar the former's progress in Koṅgu as the Madras Museum plates of Jaṭilavarmaṇ indicates. It seems that hitherto the Adigamāṇs did not come into conflict with the Pāṇḍyas. In case it had happened, it would have been so mentioned in the Vēlvikkūḍi plates.

The Madras Museum plates of the Pāṇḍya king Jaṭilavarmaṇ alias Neḍuñjadaiyaṇ (c. A. D. 765 – c. 795) dated in his seventeenth year describe his fight with a certain Adigamāṇ ruler as follows: "Having seen Adiyaṇ (who wore) a resplendent lance, turn to flight at Ayirūr Pugaḷiyūr and Āyiravēli (situated) on the northern bank of the Kāviri (which has) abundant waters (and which is) rich (in) fields, – (he) seized his (the enemy's) chariot (adorned with) sounding bells, along with a troop of horses (which were) fierce in battle; when the Pallava and the Kēraja (kings), having become his (the enemy's) allies, swelled and rose like the sea with numerous armies, so that the earth trembled, and when the western and eastern wings (of the army) joined, and were encamped (together), (the king) advanced against (the enemy) with a troop of spearmen and despatched a detachment, so that disaster befell both of them on both wings; captured the powerful king of western Koṅgu, along with (his) murderous elephants; placed (his) banner within the walls of Kūḍal (i. e., Madura) which has spacious halls decorated with precious stones; subdued Koṅgabhūmi so that the noisy drum was sounding his fame throughout Koṅkabhūmi; unfastened the string of the cruel bow; entered the large village of Kañchivayal (?) (situated) in a woody region (that was) beautified by flower gardens; and built a temple resembling a hill to Tirumāl (i. e., Viṣṇu) (in which he) might joyfully

abide."¹ These events must have taken place sometime before c. A. D. 782 when the Madras Museum plates were issued. The three places where the Pāṇḍya king defeated the Adigamāṇ ruler are said to have been situated on the northern bank of the Kāvērī.²

The Pallava king who along with the Kēraḷa king helped the Adigamāṇ chief was probably Nandivarmaṇ II or his son Dantivarmaṇ (c. A. D. 775 – c. 826). It is not improbable that the Pallava king was the overlord of the Adigamāṇ chief mentioned above. There is clear evidence that Nandivarmaṇ II held sway over, at least, part of the Kōṅgu country. An undated Grantha inscription found on a rock near the Lakshminarasimha cave temple at Namakkal (Salem district) contains the words 'Śrīdhara' and 'Sīlibhṛitam.'³ The characters of the record are assignable to the eighth century A. D.⁴ Since Śrīdhara is a well-known title of Nandivarmaṇ II,⁵ the record must be assigned to that Pallava king.

As regards the identification of the king of Western Kōṅgu scholars differ. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri thinks that Adiyaṇ and the Western Kōṅgu king of the Madras Museum plates were different rulers, and that the former was subordinate to the latter.⁶ But Mr. V. Venkayya,

1. *I. A.* Vol. XXII. p. 73.

2. *Ibid.*

3. 329 of 1938-39.

4. *Ibid.*

5. *S. I. I.* Vol. II, pt. 3, p. 357, v. 29. and *Ibid.*
F.n. No. 4.

6. *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom.* p. 62

7. *I. A.* Vol. XXII. p. 66.

Mr.K.V.Subramanya Aiyar¹ and Mr.T.V.Sadasiva Pandarathar² regard the two rulers as identical. The latter view is very probable.

The victory of the Pāṇḍya king was followed by the extension of the Pāṇḍya rule into Kongu. It is evident that the Adigamāṇ chief offered desperate resistance to the Pāṇḍya aggression.

We shall now examine the relations between the W. Gaṅgas and the Adigamāṇ chiefs. A Tamil Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscription of Śrīpuruṣar from Oḍḍapaṭṭi (Salem district) dated in his seventh year records that a certain Kūṇarundai-Vaḍugaṇ fell, perhaps in connection with a deer hunt.³ Another Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscription of Śrīpuruṣaparumar from the same place dated in his 27th year states that Eḷumaiya Nakkaṇār, a servant of Teḷiṇiyār, fell while the latter captured Yeruvāyil.⁴ Obviously these are Virakkal inscriptions. It is suggested that Śrīpuruṣar and Śrīpuruṣaparumar of the two records may be identified with the W. Gaṅga king Śrīpurusha, that the latter record⁵ refers to one of the border fights between the W. Gaṅgas and the Adigamāṇs and that Teḷiṇiyār was a member of the Adigamāṇ line.⁶ There is no difficulty in accepting the first and last suggestions.⁷ But the second

1. *Hist. Sk. An. Dk.* p. 133.

2. *Pāṇḍyar Varalāṅgu.* p. 52.

3. 212 of 1910.

4. 211 of 1910.

5. 211 of 1910.

6. Paragraph 1 and 2 of *M. E. R.* 1911.

7. The name Teḷiṇiyār may favourably be compared with Eḷiṇi or Yavaṇika mentioned in the records of a later Adigamāṇ chief (See *E. I.* Vol. VI. p. 331). It may also be noted that Adigamāṇ Nedumāṇ Aṇṇi's son

is certainly wrong. The inscription¹ is dated in the regnal year of Śrīpurusha and records the death of a servant of Teḷiṇiyār. These facts clearly show that Teḷiṇiyār was not an enemy but a subordinate of Śrīpurusha (c. A. D. 725-788).

It is not improbable that Śrīpurusha's successful invasion of the Pallava empire² took place at a time when the Adigamāṇs were feudatory to him. Attention has already been drawn to the existence of a village called Śrīpurusha-maṅgalam in the Wandiwash taluk (N. Arcot district). Two other villages in the same taluk are called Adiyaṅkuppam and Adiyaṅūr evidently after the Adiyamāṇ chiefs. This perhaps indicates that the Adigamāṇs were connected with Śrīpurusha's invasion of the Pallava empire. The existence of an Adigamāṇ inscription³ at Karaḍikkūḍi in the Vellore taluk of the N. Arcot district seems to lend support to this view.

The Adigamāṇs' subordinate alliance with the W. Gaṅgas seems to have lasted only for short period for we soon find them in alliance with the Pallava and Kēraḷa kings. The Madras Museum plates of Jaṭilavarmaṇ alias Neḍuṇḍaiyaṇ

was called Poguttēḷiṇi (K. A. Nilakanta Sastri — *History of South India*. p. 118).

1. 211 of 1910.
2. In connection with the Bāṇas we have made a passing reference to a W. Gaṅga invasion of the Pallava empire in the time of Nandivarmaṇ II. That the invasion must have happened during the reign of Śrīpurusha is clear from inscriptional and other evidences. Possibly the invasion synchronized with the capture of Kāñchi by W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya II.
3. 65 of 1945-46.

refer to this alliance.¹ This change in the attitude of the Adigamāṇs appears to have taken place after Nandivarman II's triumph over the W. Gaṅgas about A. D. 768² and resulted in W. Gaṅga occupation of the Koṅgu country as far as Komāramaṅgalam (Tiruchchengodu taluk, Salem district) in the south.³ Consequently the Adigamāṇs were driven to the south-western part of the Koṅgu country. All these appear to have taken place sometime before A. D. 771.⁴ If we examine the reference in the Madras Museum plates to a W. Koṅgu king in the light of these events it will be easy to identify him with an Adigamāṇ chief. In that case the Pāṇḍya king Neḍuṅjadaiyaṇ cannot be said to have conquered the whole of the Koṅgu country.⁵

The subsequent history of the Adigamāṇs is not clear. We find a certain Vijaya Īśvaravarman issuing records in his own name and regnal year in the Dharmapuri region.⁶ An inscription of the same ruler is found at Hebbini (Mulbagal taluk, Kolar district)...⁷ Hebbini belonged to what was then called the Gaṅga Six-thousand which was a debatable ground for the W. Gaṅgas and the Bāṇas in the 9th century. The three epigraphs of Vijaya-Īśvaravarman are written in the Vaṭṭeḷuttu script of Tamil. We do not know whether this Vijaya-Īśvaravarman and Kō-Vijaya Śkandasishya of the

1. *I. A.* Vol. XXII. p. 73.

2. See *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. V. p. 529.

3. See the Salem plates of Śrīpuṇḍra *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 145-8.

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Contra.* K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom.* p. 62.

6. *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 23 and 24.

7. *Ibid.* p. 24. Ins. III.

Rāyakōṭṭa plates (Krishnagiri taluk, Salem district) —¹ were of Pallava or W. Gaṅga extraction. One of the Kīlmuṭṭugūr inscriptions of Kō-Vijaya-Narasimhavarman (W. Gaṅga chief) dated in his 3rd year refers to a certain (Va)limadurā, the chief of Tagaḍūr-nādu.² The record may be taken to indicate further the dislodgement of the Adigamāns from Tagaḍūr-nādu and the establishment there of the sway of the W. Gaṅga chief. The circumstances under which these rulers came to exercise their sway over northern Koṅgu are not clear.

By A. D. 878 the Nolambas under Mahendra occupied the Dharmapuri region³ and continued with success their war with the Bāṇas. It seems that during all these times the Adigamāns survived in obscurity. At any rate we find them again coming into prominence in the subsequent period of Chōḷa ascendancy.⁴

To conclude W. Gaṅga Śrīpurusha's invasion of the Pallava empire was most probably assisted by the Adigamāns who later co-operated with the Pallava and Kēraḷa rulers in combating the growing power of the Pāṇḍyas under Neḍuñ-jadaiyaṇ in the latter half of the eighth century.

CULTURE:

Jainism:

It is interesting to note that in the Koṅgu country, Jainism, Vaishṇavism and Śaivism flourished side by side during the period under consideration. The Jain images

1. E. I. Vol. V. pp. 49-55.

2. E. I. Vol. IV. No. 52.

3. E. I. Vol. X. pp. 54-70; 304 of 1901.

4. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *The Cōḷas*. pp. 326-27.

found at Dharmapuri, Adamankōttai¹ and Bastipuram,² and the existence of a Jain monastery noted in an inscription from Dharmapuri³ show that Jainism had a considerable number of votaries in Koṅgu in general and at Dharmapuri in particular.

Vaiṣṇavism :

That the Adigamāns had some leanings towards Vaiṣṇavism is clear from the evidence at our disposal. The Raṅganātha temple on the hill at Namakkal was erected by an Adigamān feudatory of the Pallavas. An inscription found in the central shrine of the temple⁴ refers to the Atiyēndravishṇugriha and Atiyāṇvavāya. This makes it clear that the temple was originally called Atiyēndravishṇugriha evidently after one of the Adiyamāns. Tradition embodied in the *Koṅgumaṇḍalaśatakam* confirms the view.⁵ As the titles of Pallava Mahēndravarmāṇ I are mentioned in the inscription referred to above, it is certain that the temple must have come into existence during his time.⁶

1. Paragraph 4 of *M. E. R.* 1911.

2. Sewell - *List of Anti: Rem.*, p.196.

3. *E. I.* Vol. X. pp. 68-70.

4. 7 of 1906.

5. புதிதாய் மலையைக் குடைந்து நற்சிற் பப்பு வைரைக்
கொண்,
ஐதிகாசமான கதையைச் செதுக்குவித்திம்பர் மகிழ்ந்,
ததியேந்தர் விஷ்ணுக்கிரக மென்றேத்த வமைத்தவனும்,
மதியூகியான வதிகனும் வாழ்கொங்கு மண்டலமே!

Poem 80.

6. Another inscription found near the same temple (328 of 1938-39) mentions Manōmaya in Pallava characters of the 7th century. We do not know the Pallava king

It is not unlikely that the Lakshminarasimha cave temple at Namakkal was constructed by an Adigamāṇ ruler. The date of the temple is uncertain. Dr. M. Rajamanikkam assigns the temple to the reign of Narasimhavarman I.¹ The Government Epigraphist thinks that it possibly belongs to the same period as that of the Raṅganātha temple mentioned above.² Strangely enough neither of these two Vaishṇava temples is mentioned in the Nālāyiradivyaṇḍam, the Tamil scriptures of the Vaishṇavas.

An undated Adigamāṇ inscription from Karaḍikkudi, (Vellore taluk, N. Arcot district) records an order of a certain Adigamāṇ to the Ūravar (people of the village) of Dharmakuṟukkai in Āndai-nāḍu, communicating the remission of taxes on the land granted as tiruviḍaiyattam to the temple of Tiruveṇḍamuḍaiyār in their village.³

Saivism :

As regards Saivism it may be noted that a Śiva temple was in existence at Koḍumuḍi (Erode taluk, Coimbatore district) even in the first half of the 8th century.⁴ The temple is referred to in a hymn of St. Sundarar who sojourned the Koṅgu country.⁵ Though the temple of Mallikārjuna at

who bore this *biruda*. It is held that this *biruda* was borne by an Adigamāṇ chief. (Paragraph 2 of *M. E. R.* 1939). This is improbable.

1. *Pallavar Varalāru*. p. 123. 1944.
2. Paragraph 36 of *M. E. R.* 1906.
3. 65 of 1945-46.
4. See *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 307.
5. மற்றுப்பற்றெனக் கின்றிநின் திருப்பாதமே மனம்

பாலித்தேன்,
பெற்றலும்பிறந் தேனினிப்பிறவாத தன்மை
வந்தெய்தினேன்,

Dharmapuri (Salem district) is, "in its style, so closely alike to Pallava structures of the 8th and 9th centuries A. D., that any casual observer with an eye to ancient architecture would not hesitate to pronounce it to be of the Later Pallava style,"¹ little is known of its builders. Mr. H. Krishna Sastri's view that the unique architecture of this temple is attributable to the Nolambas of the 9th century² is not based on any epigraphical or other evidence.

Architecture and Sculpture :

The central shrine of the Raṅganātha temple at Namakkal "consists of rock-cut cave made up of (1) a raised platform with two pillars and two steps leading up to it, the base of the platform being cut into three tiers, (2) a hall with two pillars contiguous to (1) and (3) a small varandah beyond which the roof of the cave projects in a curve."³ The temple contains a number of beautiful images representing Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Nārada, Patañjali etc. The central shrine of the Lakṣmīnārasimha temple on the hill at Namakkal "consists of a rock-cut cave with three sculptured cells, two pillars and a varandah in front."⁴ The sculptures in this temple represent stories of Lord Viṣṇu's different incarnations.

கற்றவர்தொழு தேத்துஞ் சீர்கறையூறிற் பாண்டிக்
கொடுமுடி,

நற்றவாஉனை நான்மறக்கினுஞ் சொல்லுநா
நமச்சிவாயவே!

Sundarar's Devāram.

1. M. E. R. 1911. p. 4.
2. Ibid.
3. Paragraph 35 of M. E. R. 1906.
4. Paragraph 36 of M. E. R. 1906.

VII

THE WESTERN GAṄGAS

The subordination of some of the early W. Gaṅga kings to the Pallavas of Kāñchi is borne out by clear epigraphical evidence. Some scholars believe that even the founder of the W. Gaṅga dynasty, Koṅgaṇivarmaṇ alias Mādhava I was consecrated by a Pallava king to conquer the Bāṇa territory.¹ But, as we have seen in connection with the Bāṇas, there is no clear evidence for supporting this view. In any case, it is certain that the rise of the early Gaṅgas was not viewed with disfavour by the Pallavas.

Harivarmaṇ to Mādhava III.

It is possible that, sometime after the cessation of hostilities between Mayūraśarmaṇ and the Pallavas, the Bāṇas occupied that portion of the Anantapur district which was then known as Paruvi vishaya and ruled from Paruvi which may be identified with Pargi in the Hindupur taluk of that district.² At that time they are known to have been hostile to the Pallavas.³ It was probably with a view to crush the Bāṇas that Pallava Simhavarmaṇ I consecrated the W. Gaṅga prince, Harivarmaṇ (c. A. D. 445-c. 460), son of

1. Dr. N. Arokiaswami - *Op. cit.* p. 165.

2. See *E. I.* Vol. XIV. p. 331. It was because of their association, during this period, with Paruvi that the Bāṇas were called the lords of Paruvipuri (i. e. Paruvi) - *S. I. I.* Vol. II. No. 76, v. 24.

3. A. S. M. 1936. Ins. No. 16.

Mādhava II.¹ There is no doubt that Harivarman was a vassal of the Pallava king.² About c. A. D. 450, the Pallava king succeeded in subduing the Bāṇas. In his efforts the Pallava king must have certainly received substantial help from his W. Gaṅga feudatory. The Penukoṇḍa plates definitely indicate that the Bāṇas were dispossessed of Paruvi vishaya and that the W. Gaṅgas held it.³ The Digambara Jain manuscript, Lōkavibhāga which was copied in the 22nd year of Simhavarman i. e., Saka 380 at Pāṭalika in the Pāṇarāshṭra makes it clear that at that time i. e., A. D. 458 the Bāṇas were subordinate to the Pallavas and that, having left Paruvi vishaya, they had settled in the Pallava empire. The existence of Pāṇarāshṭra as part of the Pallava empire in A. D. 458 leads us to conclude that the date of the subjugation of the Bāṇas must be somewhere A. D. 450.

Vishṇugōpa who succeeded Harivarman appears to have ruled only for a short period, say, five years. The Penukoṇḍa plates⁴ the Kūḍlūr grant⁵ and the Chūkuṭṭūr grant⁶ are conspicuously silent on Vishṇugōpa though a number of

-
1. *The Classical Age*, p. 269; Dr. M. Arokiaswami *Op. cit.* p. 118. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. pp. 136-40. Some scholars maintain that Simhavarman Pallava of the Penukoṇḍa plates must be the second king of that name (See *M. E. R.* 1914, paragraph 4; R. Gopalan - *Op. cit.* p. 66.
 2. *E. I.* XIV. p. 333. Harivarman's name is spelt in different ways. Āyyavarman (*Ibid*), Arayavarman (*A. S. M.* Ins. No. 88) and Kṛishṇavarman. (*Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1924. No. 81.
 3. *E. I.* Vol. XIV. No. 24.
 4. *Ibid.* p. 336.
 5. *A. S. M.* 1930. Ins. No. 88.
 6. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1924. No. 81.

W. Gaṅga records refer to him.¹ Like his predecessor Viṣṇugōpa also must have been a Pallava feudatory. Very little is known of his political activities.

Viṣṇugōpa was followed by Mādhava III (c. A. D. 465 – c. 500) who was crowned by the Pallava king Śkandavarman III.² This W. Gaṅga king had another name, Śimhavarman, manifesting his subordination to the Pallavas.³ He married the sister of Kṛishṇavarman who belonged to the collateral line of the Kadambas.⁴ Mādhava III's matrimonial alliance with Kṛishṇavarman seems to have provoked the hostility of the main line of the Kadambas under Mṛigēśavarman (c. A. D. 475 – c. 490). The Halsi plates of Mṛigēśavarman dated in his 8th year states that he "uprooted the family of "Tuṅgagaṅga" and that he "was a very fire of destruction to the Pallavas".⁵ The identification of Tuṅgagaṅga cannot be attempted in the present state of our knowledge. But it is highly probable that the W. Gaṅga king who ruled at the time of the conflict was Mādhava III. The record clearly indicates that there was hostility between the Pallavas and the main line of the Kadambas during the period under consideration. It is not unlikely that the former supported their W. Gaṅga feudatory in the war. As regards the result of the war the allies must have sustained defeat as the inscription suggests.

1. *P. I. H. C.* 1933. p. 517; *E. C.* Vol. IX, Dod-Ball. No. 67; *Ibid.* No. 68. *A. S. M.* 1930. Ins. No. 3; *Ibid.* No. 36; 93 of 1899.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIV. p. 336.
3. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1924. No. 81.
4. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Dod-Ball. No. 68.
5. *I. A.* Vol. VI. p. 25.

Kṛishṇavarmaṇ, the father-in-law of Mādhava III, is known to have been defeated by the Pallavas.¹ We do not know whether this in any way affected Mādhava III's allegiance to the Pallavas. The coronation of Viṣṇuvārmaṇ (c. A. D. 485 – 497), son of Kṛishṇavarmaṇ mentioned above, by a Pallava king² may suggest the continuance of Pallava hegemony over Gaṅgavāḍi also. Still some records of Mādhava including the latest known one³ do not mention his connections with the Pallavas and this may raise a doubt whether he continued to be a Pallava vassal or not. But the evidences available do not help us in arriving at any definite conclusion.

Avanīta to Śivamāra II

Mādhava III's son and successor, Avanīta (c. A. D. 500 – c. 540) ascended the W. Gaṅga throne in his infancy. It is not known if he acknowledged Pallava paramountcy. It appears that he was not hostile to the Pallavas. One of his records⁴ states that the mother of the Pallava king Simhavishṇu (c. A. D. 575 – c. 600) granted a village to a Jain temple for the benefit of her husband. Though it is certain that the Pallava queen belonged to the Gaṅga territory, her exact relation to Avanīta is not clear.

Avanīta's son Durvīta (c. A. D. 540 – c. 600) exhibited hostility towards the Pallavas and his successors followed the same policy.⁵ In the first half of the 7th century Pulikēśin II conquered the W. Gaṅgas along with the Kadambas.⁶ From that time onwards till the overthrow of the W. Chāḷukyas by

1. *The Classical Age*. p. 273.

2. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1925. No. 118.

3. 1 of 1939–40.

4. *A. S. M.* 1938. pp. 80–90.

5. See M. V. Krishna Rao – *Op. cit.* pp. 37–39.

6. *E. I.* Vol. VI. pp. 8–10.

the Rāshtrakūṭas we find the W. Gaṅgas figuring as the subordinate allies of the W. Chālukyas.¹ The rise of the Rāshtrakūṭas was a menace to the W. Gaṅga kingdom. The danger made its first appearance even during the reign of Śrīpurusha.² His son Śivamāra II was engaged in a protracted war with Gōvinda III (A. D. 794 – 814). The cessation of hostilities about A. D. 813 is said to have been followed by Śivamāra's coronation by the Rāshtrakūṭa and Pallava kings of his time. The Maṇṇe plates of Mārasimha I, son of Śivamāra II, refer to his father's coronation by Rāshtrakūṭa Gōvinda III and Pallava Nandivarman.³ The same information is also furnished by a later W. Gaṅga record.⁴ The implications of the Pallava king's participation in the coronation of Śivamāra II are not clear. The supremacy of the Rāshtrakūṭas over Gaṅgavāḍi was not disputed by the Pallavas. On the other hand the Pallavas themselves acknowledged in some form Rāshtrakūṭa supremacy.⁵ Whether the tribulations of Śivamāra II consequent on the invasion of his kingdom by the Rāshtrakūṭas made him acknowledge the hegemony of the Pallavas or whether he was in any way related to the Pallavas cannot be said in the absence of any concrete evidence. As regards the date of the record L. Rice thinks that the grant may have been made in A. D. 797 to which year the details given in the record correspond and that the record would have been issued about A. D. 813 for

-
1. M. V. Krishna Rao – *Op. cit.*, pp. 47–54; Dr. M. Arokiaswami – *Op. cit.* pp. 150–152; *A. S. M.* 1939. Nos. 23 and 30.
 2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 275–282.
 3. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Nl. 60.
 4. *E. C.* Vol. IV. Yd. 60.
 5. *I. A.* Vol. XI. p. 125.

it mentions the reinstatement of Sivamāra II by Gōvinda III which took place about A. D. 813.¹ In other words it is thought that the grant originally made at the time of the Rāshtrakūṭa – W. Gaṅga struggle was confirmed with all formalities after the cessation of hostilities. In that case the Pallava king mentioned in the Maṇṇe plates must be Nandivarman III (c. A. D. 826 – 849) son of Dantivarman. Dr. Fleet, however, thinks that Nandivarman of the Maṇṇe plates must be Nanivarman II and not his grandson.² It must be noted in this connection that the inscription itself is regarded by some scholars as a spurious one.³

Prithivīpati II and his successors.

Sivamāra II was followed not by his son but by his brother Vijayāditya I and the latter was succeeded by his son Rājamalla I. The succession of the younger branch to the throne was probably due to the fact that Prithivīpati I, son of Sivamāra, was very young at the time of his father's demise. Prithivīpati I's elder brother, Mārasimha I, seems to have predeceased his father.⁴ We have seen in connection with the Bāṇas the probable date of Prithivīpati I's contact with the Pallavas, his matrimonial alliance with the Bāṇas under Vikramāditya I and his chief part in the battle of Sōremaṭi. It has also been noted that the Bāṇas were probably instrumental in bringing Prithivīpati I into close contact with the Pallavas.

Dr. Hultzsch thinks that Pīrudigaṅgaraiyar of the two Āmbūr inscriptions of Nṛpatuṅgavarman may be identified

-
1. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Intro. pp. 4–8.
 2. See paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1912.
 3. *Ibid.*
 4. *Mys. Gaz.* Vol. II. pt. II. p. 647.

with Prithivīpati I.¹ This view is endorsed by V. Venkayya.² But the identification is incorrect because Piṇḍigaṅgaraiyar of the Āmbūr inscriptions was a petty Gāṅga chief ruling over portions of the North Arcot district. He is identical with Prithivīgaṅgaraiyar of the Tippiasamudram inscription³ of Kō-Vijaya-Kampavarman. It is, however, certain that Prithivīpati I was a subordinate ally of the Pallavas. He played a significant part in the final contest between the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas at Śrīpuṇḍriyam (Kumbakonam taluk) about A. D. 880. In that war Prithivīpati fought and died for the Pallavas. The Udayēndiram plates of his grandson describe his end as follows. "Having defeated by force the Pāṇḍya lord Varaguṇa at the head of the great battle of 'Śrīpuṇḍriya', and having (thus) made (his) title Aparājita (i. e., the unconquered) significant, this hero entered the heaven of (his) friend (viz., Indra) by sacrificing his own life."⁴ Prithivīpati I was followed by his son Mārasimha II (c. A. D. 880 - 895). During his period the relations between the Pallavas and the Chōḷas of Tanjore became strained. Mārasimha II seems to have sided with the Chōḷas. It is highly probable that Āditya I was assisted by the Gāṅga king in his conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam.⁵ The Takkōlam inscription of Āditya I⁶ dated in his 24th year (A. D. 895) recording a grant made by Prithivīpati II, son of Mārasimha points to the same conclusion. It is worthy of note that the Chōḷa king Āditya I does not claim to have conquered

1. *E. I.* Vol. IV. No. 23. p. 182.

2. Paragraph 9 of *M. E. R.* 1906.

3. 174 of 1939-40.

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. p. 387, v. 18.

5. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op. cit.* p. 114.

6. *E. I.* Vol. XIX. No. 12, p. 88.

the successors of Prithivīpati I, probably because of his friendly relations with them after the battle of Śrīpuraṁbiyam.

Individual Gaṅga Chiefs.

Apart from the W. Gaṅga rulers some individual Gaṅga chiefs also figure in Pallava records as the subordinates of the Pallavas. These chiefs were mostly confined to the North Arcot district. The Kuḷidikki inscription of Nandivarman II dated in his 52nd year mentions his Gaṅga feudatory by name Gaṅgadiyaraiyar Kaṇṇāḍu Peruṅgaṅgar who was the chief of Kaṛkāṭṭūr.¹ This chief fought and lost his life for the Pallava king in his war with the W. Gaṅgas.²

It is presumed that Śiyakaṇ who is mentioned in an undated inscription of Dantivarman from Tirupati was a Gaṅga feudatory of the Pallava king.³ An inscription from Paḷlikonda (Vellore taluk, N. Arcot district) of Nandivarman III⁴ dated in his 2nd year states that Śelvaṇvāṇaraiyaṇ, son of Amaṇigaṅgaraiyar constructed a *mukhamāṇḍapa* probably for the Nāganāthēśvara temple at that place. It is not clear whether the chief mentioned in this record was a Gaṅga or Bāṇa chief.

The Siyamaṅgalam inscription of Nandivarman III dated in his 3rd year refers to a Gaṅga chief called NērguṭṭiPerumāṇ.⁵

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXII, pp. 110–113.

2. *Ibid.* See also the chapter on the Bāṇas.

3. *T. T. etc. Devasthanam Inss.* Vol. I. No. 2 and Intro. p. 6. Another Gaṅga chief Raṇasiṅgaṇ who is mentioned in an inscription from the same place is presumed to be a Pallava feudatory (*Ibid.* No. 5 and Intro. p. 6).

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 45.

5. *E. I.* Vol. VI. No. 32. Ins. B. Some scholars assign this record to Nandivarman II. (R. Gopalan, *Op cit.* Appe. A. No. 47).

The Sōlapuram inscription of Kō-Vijaya-Kampavarman dated in his 8th year mentions a W. Gaṅga chief by name Pṛithivī Gaṅgaraiyar¹ who should be different from his namesake mentioned in the Āmbūr, Mēlpaṭṭi and Tippasamudram inscriptions.² It is not clear in what way he was related to the W. Gaṅga dynasty, particularly to Pṛithivīpati I. Nor do we know his part in the frontier wars of the Pallava empire. His son Rājāditya is known to have been a subordinate of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarman.³

Pṛithivīgaṅgaraiyar, another Gaṅga feudatory of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarman is mentioned in the Tippasamudram inscription.⁴ He is most probably identical with the person of the same name mentioned in the Mēlpaṭṭi and Āmbūr inscriptions.⁵ He must be different from his namesake referred to in the Sōlapuram record of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarman for the latter passed away by the 8th regnal year of that Pallava king whereas the former figures in the inscriptions issued after that year.⁶ He played an important part in the frontier wars of the Pallava empire. The Mēlpaṭṭi inscription⁷ which records a conflict between the Bāṇas and this chief indicates that on one occasion he turned against the Pallavas. The Tippasamudram inscription of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarman issued seven years after Mēlpaṭṭi inscription shows that Pṛithivīgaṅgaraiyar was reduced to obedience. The

1. *E. I.* Vol. VII. p. 192.

2. *E. I.* Vol. IV. pp. 180-183; *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. pp. 143-147; 174 of 1939-40.

3. *E. I.* Vol. VII. p. 192.

4. 174 of 1939-40.

5. *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. pp. 143-147; *E. I.* Vol. IV. pp. 180-183.

6. See paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1939-43.

7. *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. pp. 143-147.

former record states that this chief and his wife, Ilāḍaperundēviyar constructed as the gift of their daughter, Ayyak-kutti, a channel called Viḷuppēraraiyaṇ, from the river (S. Palar) to the tank at Valivalakkamaṅgalam which may be identified with Tippiasamudram itself.¹

Another W. Gaṅga chief known from inscriptions is Kō-Vijaya Narasimhavarmaṇ. He must have been a Pallava feudatory as his name indicates. The inference is supported by the fact that most of his records are found in the region over which the Pallavas exercised their sway. The dating of the records of this chief² in his own regnal years shows that his status was higher than that of an ordinary feudatory. This Gaṅga chief is assigned to the first half of the 9th century on the ground that the script of his records is referable to that period.³ But he must have lived in the second half of the 9th century for his Baṅgavāḍi inscription⁴ mentions the combatants who met at Sōremaṭi about A. D. 878. He supported the Bāṇas in their skirmishes with W. Gaṅgas and the Noḷambas.⁵ It seems that he exercised his sway over Tagaḍūrṇāḍu also.⁶

In fine the W. Gaṅga feudatories of the Pallavas helped them in subduing the Bāṇas in the 5th century and made common cause with the Pallavas against the main line of the Kadambas. The triumph of Prithivīpati I and the Bāṇas in the battle of Sōremaṭi (A. D. 878) contributed, to a great

1. Paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1939-43.

2. *E. I.* Vol. IV, No. 22 and 52; 69 of 1933-34;
E. I. Vol. VII, p. 22. Ins. A.

3. Paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1933-34.

4. *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 22-23.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *E. I.* Vol. IV. p. 360.

extent, to the rift in the W. Gaṅga-Noḷamba alliance and thus averted possible dangers to the Pallava empire from those power. If the W. Gaṅga-Noḷamba combination had not been defeated at that battle the condition of the Pallava power in the last quarter of the 9th century would have been more precarious than it actually was. By far the most remarkable service of Pṛithivīpati to the Pallava empire was his heroic part in the battle of Śrīpuṇḍriyam. In that war he fell fighting to the end for his overlord, Aparājita. But the successors of Pṛithivīpati I followed a very different policy. They did not stand by the Pallavas and seem to have sided with the Chōḷas of Tanjore. It is very likely that they contributed, though in a small measure, to the Chōḷa conquest of Tondaimaṇḍalam in the reign of Āditya I.

As regards the individual Gaṅga chiefs they were not of great help to the Pallavas. They were not sufficiently strong to combat the Noḷamba inroads into the Pallava empire. Some of them played a hostile part as in the case of the later Pṛithivīgaṅgaraiyar. But their support to the Bāṇas must have contributed, to a certain extent, to the latter's victory at Sōremaṭi.

Culture :

Our account of the cultural role of these feudatories is meagre on account of paucity of information. The early W. Gaṅga feudatories of the Pallavas were noted for their patronage of Sanskrit learning. Many of their records are in Sanskrit language though in Kannāḍa script.¹ The Penukoṇḍa plates describe Harivarman as having known "the essence of many Śāstras, Itihāśas and Purāṇas."² The

1. e. g., *A. S. M.* 1930. Ins. No. 88 and *E. I.* XIV. No. 24.

2. *E. I.* Vol. XIV, p. 336, L. 6.

Keregalūr grant of Mādhava III¹ contains terms which are met with in the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya.² The same record describes Mādhava III's skill in polity as being: "too deep even for those versed in the Arthaśāstra."³ These go to prove that even in the 5th century A. D. the Sanskrit scholars of Gaṅgavāḍi were familiar with the great work of Kauṭilya. There are a number of inscriptions recording the gifts to pious scholars of the Gaṅga kings and chiefs.⁴

Buddhism :

The prevalence of Buddhism in Gaṅgavāḍi is borne out by epigraphical evidence. An inscription of Harivarman⁵ refers to a Buddhist disputant Vādimadagajendra who was vanquished by a Brāhmaṇ in philosophical disputation. A Sanskrit inscription of Mādhava III records his gift of lands to a Buddhist vihāra i. e., monastery and mentions a certain Buddhasatva who was perhaps connected with the institution.⁶ Owing to great royal support, Jainism overshadowed Buddhism in Gaṅgavāḍi.

1. A. S. M. 1930. Ins. No. 3.
2. *Ibid.* p. 124.
3. *Ibid.* p. 117.
4. I. A. Vol. VIII. pp. 212-215; A. S. M. 1932 Ins. No. 1; *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1914-1915, paragraphs 61-63; *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1921, paragraphs 38 and 39 - this record is considered to be a spurious one; E. I. Vol. XIV. No. 24; A. S. M. 1930. Ins. Nos. 3. and 88; *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1924 pp. 79-81; 392 of 1940-41; 326 of 1912; E. I. Vol. IV. No. 22. Ins. A.
5. I. A. Vol. VIII. pp. 212-215.
6. Paragraphs 47-50 of *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1909-10.

Jainism :

In Gaṅgavāḍi Jainism was very popular and enjoyed the lion's share of royal patronage. Digambara Jains were numerous. They maintained close contact with their brethren in other parts of South India. There were several Jain temples and monasteries. An inscription of Mādhava III states that on the advice of Viradēva, a Jain sage, the king made a grant of lands to the Arhad temple established by the Mūlasaṅgha in the Perbboḷal village of the Mudukottūr vishaya.¹ Despite the fact that Pallava political influence in Gaṅgavāḍi disappeared in the middle of the 5th century, the Jains maintained close cultural contact with the Pallava empire as evidenced by the Pallava architectural and sculptural influences that we find in some W. Gaṅga Jain temples of later period.²

Saivism and Vaishṇavism :

The epigraphs of the early W. Gaṅgas clearly show that there must have been large number of the followers of Saivism and Vaishṇavism in Gaṅgavāḍi. Scholars belonging to these denominations were patronised by the kings. Mādhava III worshipped Śiva³ and was well-known for his renewal of Brāhmaṇ endowments long since ceased.⁴ An inscription from Śiyamaṅgalam (South Arcot district) of VijayaNandivikramavarmaṇ dated in his third year states that Aḍavi, the headman of Tiruppālaiyūr, erected a *maṇḍapa* in front of the Śthambēśvara temple (at Śiyamaṅgalam) with the permission

1. *E. C.* X Malur 73.

2. The Pañchakūtā Basti at Kambadahaḷli, Nāgamaṅgala taluk, is a good example. See *A. S. M.* 1939. p. 45.

3. *E. C.* Vol. IX. p. 7.

4. *E. I.* Vol. IX. Dod. Ball. 67.

of the Gaṅga king Nērguṭṭi Perumāṇ. Obviously Aḍavi was a subject of the Gaṅga chief who was feudatory to the Pallava king Nandivarmaṇ III.¹ The Sōḷapuram inscription of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṇ dated in his 8th year records that Rājāditya, son of Pṛithivigaṅgaraiyar constructed a Śiva temple in memory of his deceased father.²

Vishṇugōpa who was celebrated for his saintly qualities was an ardent follower of Vaishṇavism and was "devoted to the worship of Gurus, Cows and Brāhmaṇas."³ We have already noted that Dantivarmaṇ's feudatory, Siyakaṇ, made a grant to the Vishṇu temple at Tirupati.⁴ It is thus clear that in matters of religion the W. Gaṅga feudatories of the Pallavas were not merely tolerant but even liberal.

1. See *E. I.* Vol. VI. No. 32.

2. *E. I.* Vol. VII. p. 192.

3. *E. C.* Vol. X. Malur 73.

4. *T. T. etc. Devasthanam Inss.* Vol. I. No. 2.

VIII

INDIVIDUAL FEUDATORIES.

Besides the feudatory dynasties noted above, some individual chiefs are also known to have been subordinate to the Pallavas. All the available information regarding such chiefs and their services to the Pallava empire is given below in chronological order.

The undated Vallam inscription of Mahēndravarmaṇ I mentions one of his vassals by name Śkandasēna, son of Vasantapriyarāja.¹ Śkandasēna excavated the Śiva cave temple at Vallam near Chingleput.² This temple is one of the oldest temples of the Tamil country.

Some of the Muṇṇaiya chiefs or Muṇṇaiyaraiyars who exercised their sway over what was then known as Tirumuṇṇaiyappāḍi-naḍu (S. Arcot district) were subordinate to the Pallavas. Narasiṅga Muṇṇaiyar, the foster-father of St. Sundarar, one of the Dēvaram trio, must have been a feudatory of the Pallava king Narasimhavarmaṇ II.³ Another Muṇṇaiya chief figures in an inscription of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṇ.

Much is not known about the chiefs of Chēdi-naḍu (S. Arcot district) whose territory was probably subject to Pallava influence though no record of the Pallavas before the

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. No. 72. pp. 340-341; paragraph 7 of *M. E. R.* 1893; *J. O. R.* Vol. VII. p. 230.

2. *Ibid.*

3. See *Tamil Poṭil.* Vol. III. pp. 201-209.

time of Narasimhavarman II, is found there. According to the *Periyapurāṇam*, Meypporuḷ Nāyaṇār who lived in the interval between St. Sambandar and St. Sundarar, was a chief of Chēdi-naḍu. It is possible that he was a Pallava vassal. In the period of Chōḷa ascendancy the Chēdi chiefs figure very prominently.¹

Udayachandra, the lord of the river Vēgavati and of the city of Vilvala,² was one of the leading feudatories of Nandivarman II. It seems that he held sway over portions of the Chingleput and North Arcot districts. The Udayēdiram plates which testify to his loyalty and prowess states that the Pūchan family to which Udayachandra belonged had been in uninterrupted hereditary service of the Pallavas. As regards his services to the Pallava king, the plates describe as follows: "when he (Udayachandra) perceived that Pallavamalla was besieged in Nandipura by the Dramiḷa princes, unable to bear this, like the visible death of the crowd of the enemies of Pallavamalla, (he) slew with (his) sharp sword.....the Pallava king Chitramāya and others; he defeated the hostile army on the battle-fields of Nimbavana, Chūtavana, Saṁkara-grāma, Nellūr, Nelvēli, Sūravarundūr and so forth, and (thus) bestowed the whole kingdom many times on the Pallava spilt the opposing Śabara king, Udayana, in the terrible battle of Nelvēli, which could hardly be entered by a common man and seized (his) mirror-banner made of a peacock's tail; who in the Northern region also, pursued the Nishada chief, called Pṛithivīvyāgra who desiring to become very powerful was running after the horse of the Aśvamēdha,

1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op cit.* p. 430.

2. This place is identified with Vilvalangara-Villivalam. in the Chingleput district. See R. Gopalan. *Op. cit.* p. 124. F.n. 3.

defeated (him) and ordered (him) out of the district (vishaya) of Vishṇurāja (which) he subjected to the Pallava, and seized faultless pearl necklaces of excellent lustre, an immeasurable heap of gold, and elephants; (and) who destroyed (the fort of) Kālidurga, which was protected by the Goddess Kālī and defeated the Pāṇḍya army at the village of Maṇṇaikuḍi."¹

As regards the places where Udayachandra achieved victories for the Pallava king, Nimbavana, Chūtavana, Saṅkaragrāma and Maṇṇaikuḍi may be identified respectively with Vēppaṅgaḍu, Kōvilūr, Saṅkaraṇārkuḍikāḍu (Pattukkottai taluk) and Maṇṇaikuḍi (Arantangi taluk) in the Tanjore district.² Śūravarṇundūr may be provisionally identified with Śūraviṇḍur in the Chidambaram taluk of the South Arcot district.³ Dr. Hultzsch regards the Śabara king as a Tamil chieftain and identifies Nelveli with modern Tinnevely.⁴ If the Śabara king was a Tamil chieftain, we may identify Nelveli with the village of the same name in the Arantangi taluk of the Tanjore district. But, if as Mr. R. Gopalan says,⁵ the Śabaras are identical with the modern Sauras of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts, it would not be possible to identify Nelveli with any place in the Tamil country; we must look for it either in the Telugu country or in the region bordering on it. As regards the Nishāda chief, he must be different from the Nishāda chieftains of the former Pudukkottai state for the campaigns against him are known to have taken place in the region to

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. 3. p. 372.

2. R. Gopalan. *Op. cit.* pp. 125-126. *Contra.* K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar. *J. O. R.* Vol. XIX. p. 192.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. 3. p. 364.

5. *The Pallavas.* p. 125.

the north of Tonḍaimaṇḍalam. It is possible that the battle between this chief and the Pallava general took place at Nellūr (Nellore district). Dr. D. C. Sircar suggests that Pṛithivīvyāgara, the Nishāda chief might be a Nala king.¹ Viṣṇuraja mentioned in the plates may be identified with the Eastern Chālukya king Viṣṇuvardhana III (A. D. 709-746).² It is not possible to identify the fort of Kāḷidurga which was destroyed by Udayachandra. Dr. Hultzsch rejects its identification with Kōḷikkōḍu (Calicut).³ Lastly our conclusion regarding the identification of the places and persons mentioned in the Udayēdiram plates are bound to be tentative in the present state of our knowledge.

There is, however, no doubt about the fact that Udayachandra had borne the chief part in stabilizing the position of Nandivarman II as a ruler and in crushing his powerful and numerous enemies. The Udayēdiram plates record the grant to one hundred and eight Brāhmaṇas of the village of Kumāramaṅgala-Vellāttūr in the Paśchimāśrayanadī viśaya and two water levers in the village of Koṭṭagrāma and state that the gifted village was named after Udayachandra.⁴ The grant was made by the Pallava king at the request of Udayachandra.

Another copper-plate record from Pullūr (Polur taluk, N. Arcot district) dated in the 33rd year of Nandivarman II states that at the request of Avaṇichandra Yuvarāja, the lord of Vilvalapura, the Pallava king made the grant to one hundred and eight Brāhmaṇas of the four villages, Nelli,

1. *The Classical Age*. p. 254. F.n. No. 1.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. 3. p. 364.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. 3. p. 372.

Pullūr, Kuḍiyūr and Takkār in Pālkuṇṇa-Kōṭṭam, clubbed them together into one unit and named it Nayadhīramaṅgalam after one of his surnames.¹ There is no doubt that Avaṇichandra of this record was a vassal of the Pallava king. Vilvalapura mentioned in the record may be identified with Vilvala of the Udayēndiram plates. It is probable that Avaṇichandra was the son Udayachandra.² The fact that the findspot of the record is close to the village of Udayēndiram seems to support this view.³ It is not unlikely that Avaṇichandra of the Pullūr record is identical with his namesake mentioned in an inscription from Kāñchīpuram⁴ dated in the 17th year of Dantivarman.⁵

Another feudatory of Nandivarman II was the chief of Maṅgala-nāḍu who is mentioned in the Paṭṭattāmaṅgalam plates.⁶ The plates record that at the request of Maṅgala-nāḍālvāṇ and the Āṇatti of Ālappākka-Vijayanallūlāṇ, king Vijaya-Nandi-Vikramayarman issued an order in the 61st year of his reign to the nāṭṭār of Āravala-Kūṛram in Chōḷa-nāḍu, granting as brahmadēya 40 velis of land which included two old brahmadēyas granted in the 59th year of the same king at the request of Maṅgalanāḍālvāṇ and the Āṇatti of Ālappāka-Vijayanallūlāṇ.⁷ It is also recorded in the plates that the brahmadēya was constituted as a new village under the name of Paṭṭattāmaṅgalam. As the villages in Āravala-Kūṛram are mostly found in the Negapatam taluk,

-
1. 9 of 1939-40 (copper plates).
 2. Paragraph 5 of *M. E. R.* 1939-43.
 3. *Ibid.*
 4. *S. I. I.* Vol. IV. No. 132.
 5. Paragraph 5 of *M. E. R.* 1939-43.
 6. *E. I.* Vol. XVIII. pp. 115-124.
 7. *Ibid.* p. 116.

Paṭṭattāmaṅgalam also must be in the same taluk.¹ Maṅgala-nāḍu must have comprised the region in and around the village Maṅgal in the Tanjore district. Though the chief of Maṅgala-nāḍu is described as “a great hero, virtuous and respected by the good”, his martial exploits are not known.

An inscription from Toṇḍūr (Ginjee taluk, S. Arcot district) dated in the 6th year of Dantivarman registers a gift of 16 kaḷaṇḍu of gold by Vinṇakōvaraiyar, a feudatory chief, to provide from the interest on the amount, offerings to Ērṟukkunṇarāṇār Bhaṭṭāri for the merit of certain persons.² The Kāñchīpuram record of the same Pallava king refers to a gift of gold made by Avaṇichandra.³

A fragmentary epigraph from Kāverippākkam (Arakonam taluk, N. Arcot district) dated in the 13th year of Nandivarman III records a gift of gold by the daughter-in-law of Ayyakki Paṅgaḷa Aḍigaḷ.⁴ It is presumed that Ayyakki Paṅgaḷa Aḍigaḷ was the chief of Paṅgaḷa-nāḍu which comprised a portion of the present N. Arcot district.⁵ In that case he must be a feudatory of the Pallava king.

The Marudāḍu inscription (Wandiwash taluk, N. Arcot district) of Nṛpatungavarman dated in his 12th year records that a certain Koṅgaraiyar Niṇṇaperumāṇ constructed a weir to the tank at Marudāḍu and renovated the sluice.⁶ It is not known if this chief was a Gaṅga one. Another record from Paramēśvaramaṅgalam (Madurantakam taluk, Chingleput

-
1. *Ibid.* p. 119.
 2. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 42; 283 of 1916.
 3. *S. I. I.* Vol. IV. No. 132; 34 of 1888.
 4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 50; 406 of 1905.
 5. Intro. to No. 50 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.
 6. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 65; 417 of 1912.

district) of the same Pallava king dated in his 16th year states that the committee (Gaṇapperumakkaḷ) of the temple called Sailēśvaram agreed to provide offerings during the mid-day service of the god Mahādēva at Sailēśvaram in Paramēśvara-maṅgalam in lieu of the interest on 11 kaḷaṅju of gold received by them from Nandi-Niraimati, son of Maṇṇaikuḍi-Maṇamaḍakki Viḷuppēraraiyar.¹ It is surmised that the title, Maṇṇaikuḍi-Maṇamaḍakki, prefixed to the name Viḷuppēraraiyar apparently refers to the battle at Maṇṇaikuḍi in which a Pāṇḍya king was defeated by Udayachandra, the general of Nandivarman II and that one of the ancestors of Viḷuppēraraiyar took part in that battle.² Mr. V. Venkatasubba Ayyar who does not contradict this view expresses another possibility; he thinks that Maṇṇaikuḍi and Maṇamaḍakki might be the native village and hamlet of Viḷuppēraraiyar and as such find mention in the record. Villages having the same names are indeed found in the Arantangi taluk of the Tanjore district. Nevertheless the former view is probable for generally in inscriptions only one village of the donor is mentioned.

The Tiruvadi inscription (Cuddalore taluk, S. Arcot district) of Nripatunḡavarman dated in his 16th year states that Muṇṇaiyakōṇṇiavaraiyaṇ, son of Muṇṇaippēraraiyar, a resident of Peruṅḡuḷattūr, repaired the temple of Tiruvīraṭ-ṭāṇam and endowed gold for a perpetual lamp.³ As Muṇṇaippēraraiyar is spoken of in the record as living at Peruṅḡuḷattūr, he must be a contemporary feudatory of the Pallava king.

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 69; 257 of 1912.

2. Paragraph 11 of *M. E. R.* 1913.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VIII, No. 303; 35 of 1903.

The Tiruvorriyūr record of the same Pallava king dated in his 18th year registers a gift of gold to the Śiva temple at Tiruvorriyūr (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) by Pāṇiyāṇ pilli, wife of Viḍelviḍugu Pallavaraiyar.¹ Obviously Viḍelviḍugu Pallavaraiyar was a Pallava vassal probably in charge of Umbaḷa-nāḍu which is referred to in the inscription.²

An inscription from Tiruchcheṇṇampūṇḍi (Tanjore taluk) of Nripatūṅgavarman dated in the 22nd year records a gift of gold for a perpetual lamp to the God of Tirukkaḍaimuḍimā by Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyar of Koṇḍa-nāḍu.³ Another inscription from Tirukkōḍikāval (Kumbakonam taluk, Tanjore district) dated in the 24th year of the same Pallava king registers an agreement made by the assembly of Nāraṇakka-Chaturvēdimangalam to burn a perpetual lamp in the temple of Mahādeva at Tirukkōḍikāvu for the interest on 15 kaḷaṇḍu of gold received by them from Veṭṭuvadiraiyaṇ alias Mallāṇ Vēṇḍaḍavaṇ of Koṇḍa-nāḍu.⁴ It is practically certain that the chief mentioned in this record is identical with his namesake referred to in the preceding inscription. From other epigraphical evidences it is known that Koṇḍa-nāḍu was a subdivision of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam.⁵ Two inscriptions from Kīlūr (Tirukkoyilur taluk, S. Arcot district) of Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyars are dated in the 3rd year but do not mention any overlord.⁶ It is not impossible that these two records belong to the latter part of Aparājita's reign. If this view is correct, the inscriptions may be taken to indicate the independent

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 70; 162 of 1912.

2. See Intro. to No. 70 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 522; 301 of 1901.

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 78; 22 of 1930-31.

5. See *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 933.

6. *Ibid.* Nos. 933 and 934.

position of the Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyars. Nothing is known of the part played by these chiefs in the overthrow of the Pallava power by Āditya I. But their subordination to the Chōḷas in the subsequent period is borne out by some epigraphical evidence.¹ It is highly improbable that the Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyars were identical with the Bāṇas.²

Two epigraphs from Uttiramērūr (Chingleput district), one dateless and damaged³ and the other incomplete and dated in the 26th year,⁴ of Nṛipatūṅgavarmaṇ refer to a feudatory chief by name Vijayanallūḷāṇ Kaḍavadiyaraiyaṇ alias Būdi-dhiraṇ who belonged to Kūkūr in Mikūrūviḷāṇaḍu in the Muttaraiya country. Vijayanallūḷāṇ of this record must be different from his namesake mentioned in the Paṭṭat-tāṁgāḷam plates of Nandivarmaṇ II. Būdi-dhiraṇ does not appear to be a Muttaraiya chief.

An inscription from Satyavēḍu (Ponneri taluk, Chingleput district) dated in the 4th year of Aparājitaavarmaṇ registers a gift of the village Tuṛaiyūr including its income in gold and kind for conducting worship in the temple of Mahādeva at Tirumataṅganpaḷḷi in Tekkūr-nāḍu, a subdivision of Paiyyur-iḷāṅkōṭṭam by Kumārandai Kuṛumbarādittaṇ alias Kaḍu-paṭṭippēraraiyaṇ who belonged to Chēra-nāḍu.⁵ The village Tuṛaiyūr is identified with the village of the same name in the Madurantakam taluk of the Chingleput district.⁶ Another record from the same place dated in the 5th year of the same

1. 104 of 1940-41.

2. *Contra* – paragraph 26 of *M. E. R.* 1939-43.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VI. No. 367.

4. *Ibid.* No. 368.

5. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 86; 31 of 1912.

6. Intro. to No. 85 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.

Pallava king records a gift of 100 sheep for burning a perpetual lamp in the same temple by Pōṛṛinaṅgai, wife of Kumārandai Kuṛumbarāditaṅ alias Kādupaṭṭippēraraiyaṅ.¹ Obviously the chief mentioned in this record is identical with his namesake mentioned in the preceding record. He is stated to have belonged to Chēra-nāḍu. We do not know how he came into contact with the Pallava king. But there is no doubt about his subordination to the Pallava king for the two records are dated in the regnal year of the latter. It is suggested that the chief might be a member of the Pallava dynasty.² Another inscription from Tiruvoṛṛiyūr (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) dated in the 8th year of Aparājita registers an endowment of 60 kaḷaṅju of gold by Paitāṅgi Kaṇḍaṅ, chief of Kāṭṭūr in Vaḍakarai-Iṇṇambar-nāḍu, a subdivision of Chōḷa-nāḍu for providing on the day of his natal star Svāti, offerings to the deity and for burning a perpetual lamp in the temple of Mahādēva at Tiruvoṛṛiyūr.³ The offerings included rice, ghee, plantains, sugar, vegetables, arecanuts, betel-leaves, tender coconuts, Pañchagavya, sandal paste and camphor. Iṇṇambar-nāḍu must have comprised the region in and around the present village, Iṇṇambur in the Kumbakonam taluk of the Tanjore district. The record under consideration testifies to the continuance of Pallava supremacy over the Chōḷa country. A fourth record of Aparājita from Nemali (Tiruttani division, Chittoor district) dated in his 10th year registers a gift of land for playing musical instruments during Śrībali ceremonies in the four temples (of the place) by Sattandai Suttamallaṅ alias Aṇuttirapallavaraiyaṅ of Singapuram.⁴ A dateless inscription from

-
1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 89; 32 of 1912.
 2. Paragraph 10 of *M. E. R.* 1912.
 3. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 92; 159 of 1912.
 4. 154 of 1942-43.

Tirunāmanallūr (Tirukkoyilur taluk, S. Arcot district) records a grant of land as archanābhōga by Muṇaiyadaraiyaṇ alias Aparājitaṇ Kulamāṇikkaṇ Mahādēvaṇ.¹ Since the record does not mention any overlord, it is doubtful if the chief mentioned in the record was a feudatory of Aparājita. If the inscription be assignable to the reign of Aparājita, it may be taken to indicate the assumption by the Muṇaiya chief of independence perhaps some time before Aprājita's conflict with his overmighty Chōḷa feudatory, Āditya I.

An inscription from Tiruvoṭṭiyūr dated in the 9th year of Kō-Vijaya-Kampavarmaṇ registers a gift of 30 kaḷaṇḍu of gold by Amarnidi alias Pallavadiyaraiaṇ of Kaṇjaṇūr in the Indaḷūr-nāḍu, and another gift of a similar amount by a person whose name is lost in the record, for two perpetual lamps in the Śiva temple at Tiruvoṭṭiyūr.² Apparently Amarnidi must have been a minor feudatory chief. Kaṇjaṇūr may be identified with the village of the same name in the Kumbakonam taluk.³ Indaḷūr-nāḍu must have comprised the region in and around the village Indaḷūr (Tanjore taluk) including Kaṇjaṇūr.

1. 230 of 1939-40.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 100; 188 of 1912.

3. Intro. to No. 100 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.

A NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGY AND GENEALOGY OF THE PALLAVAS FROM NANDIVARMAṆ II.

The chronology and genealogy of the Pallavas, like those of the Pāṇḍyas of the post-Saṅgam period, are still to a considerable extent uncertain. It is proposed here to analyse the chronology and genealogy of the Pallavas from Nandivarmaṇ II. Even for starting our analysis from Nandivarmaṇ II we have to go back a little. The present writer follows the schemes furnished by Mr. R. Gopalan in his work, 'History of the Pallavas of Kāñchi'. But Gopalan's schemes, particularly the chronological one, have been seriously modified by many scholars on different grounds. Some scholars are disposed to examine a particular aspect of the problem overlooking the other aspects. But such an approach will not solve the problems. We shall therefore make a comprehensive, but brief, study of the problems examining one by one the important views connected with them.

In his article on the 'Date of the Accession of Nandivarmaṇ II Pallavamalla'¹ Dr. N. Venkataramanayya discusses Mr. K.V. Subramanya Aiyar's date of the accession of Nandivarmaṇ II, dismisses it relying on the data of the Mallam inscription of Nandipōttaraśar² and the Maṇṇe plates of Mārasimha I³ and assumes that A. D. 725 should be the first regnal year of Nandivarmaṇ II.⁴ The conclusions of Dr. Venkataramanayya are mainly based on the two records mentioned above. As regards the first the details must be fully analysed and for that a translation of the record is given below.

-
1. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII. pp. 1-8.
 2. *N. D. I.* Vol. I. p. 429. Gudur 54.
 3. *E. C.* Vol. IX. N.A. 60.
 4. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII. p. 7.

"Prosperity. In the 15th year of the reign of Nandipōttaraśar, we, the men of the district (naḍu), the villagers and the heads of assemblies, gave at the order of Chaḷukkiaraśar on the petition of Āḷuvaaraśar to (the God) Subramanya at Tiruvānbur (situated) in Paiyyurilangōttam, 35 Kaḷaṇḇu of gold given by Maduvār for (maintaining) lamps(?)”¹

Nandipōttaraśar referred to in the record is doubtless Nandivarman II. Since the record is dated in his regnal year it is certain that, at the time when it was issued, the Mallam area must have been under his rule. It is not clearly known whether the Chaḷukkiaraśar of the inscription was an ally or a vassal of the Pallava king. Dr. Venkataramanayya rejects Mr. V. Venkayya's view that the Chaḷukkiaraśar of the record was an Eastern Chāḷukya subordinate of Nandivarman II and thinks that he belonged to the Bādāmi branch of the Chāḷukya family.² What made the Chaḷukkiaraśar acknowledge the friendship or overlordship of the Pallava king is not known. There is clear evidence³ that the Chāḷukyas of Bādāmi regarded the Pallavas as their hereditary enemies. If Dr. Venkataramanayya's view is accepted the record under consideration may be treated as the sole evidence of the solitary instance of Pallava-W. Chāḷukya friendship. But the present writer thinks that the identification of Chaḷukkiaraśar suggested by Dr. Venkataramanayya is highly problematical. In fact Dr. Venkataramanayya himself states that "no instance of a Bādāmi Chāḷukyan king becoming a subordinate of a Pallava after the time of Narasimha I is known."⁴

1. *N. D. I.* Vol. I. p. 429, Gudur 54.

2. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII. pp. 4 and 5.

3. *E. I.* Vol. IX, No. 28, p. 205.

1. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII, p. 4.

Identifying Chalukkiaraśar of this inscription with Vikramāditya II (A. D. 733-45) and supposing that the inscription was inscribed during the course of his first invasion of Kāñchī in A. D. 733-34 Dr. Venkataramanayya states that the 15th regnal year of Nandivarman II falls in A. D. 733-34 and as such his accession could not have happened before A. D. 718-719. He further states that "at the same time we must keep in mind that his accession could have taken place at any time between this date and A. D. 730-31"¹

Now, two things remain to be noted here. One is the identification of Chalukkiaraśar with Vikramāditya II. This is only a conjecture of Dr. Venkataramanayya and is not based on any definite evidence. The other is Vikramāditya II's invasion of the Pallava empire. He is known to have invaded the Pallava empire thrice. We do not know for certain whether the invasion referred to by Dr. Venkataramanayya was the first or second or third of the invasions of Vikramāditya II. Nor do we possess any evidence about the exact dates of these invasions. As regards Nandivarman II's last regnal year Dr. Venkataramanayya relies wholly on the Maṇṇe plates of the Western Gaṅga prince Mārasimha I, son of Śivamāra II. Dr. Venkataramanayya believes that the release and coronation of Śivamāra II by Govinda III went together, that the coronation took place in A. D. 789 and that Nandivarman referred to in the Maṇṇe plates must be Nandivarman II. Further, he assumes that the Pallava king must have died in A. D. 790 and therefore his accession must have taken place in A. D. 725.²

1. *Ibid.* pp. 4 and 5.

2. *Ibid.* p. 7.

Both Dr. Fleet and Louis Rice regard the Maṇṇe plates as a spurious record. Both consider the coronation of Śivamāra II by the Rāshtrakūṭa and Pallava kings of his time as a probable one but both think that the event could not have taken place towards the close of the 8th century but must have happened in the early years of the next century.¹ Further according to Dr. Altekar the Rāshtrakūṭa king Gōvinda III came to power only in A. D. 793 and this precludes all possibility of Śivamāra II's coronation taking place before that year. Obviously the conclusions of Dr. Venkataramanayya are based on very doubtful testimony.

Without discussing the problem, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri gives the following chronology of the later Pallavas in his *History of South India* (p. 163)

" Narasimhavarman II	A. D. 680—720
Paramēśvaravarman II	720—731
Nandivarman II	731—795
Dantivarman	795—845
Nandivarman III	844—866
Nṛpatuṅgavarman	855—896
Aparājita	879—897"

Prof. Sastri's views on the dates of Narasimhavarman II and Paramēśvaravarman II require careful examination on account of their bearings on the date of Nandivarman II. On the basis of some late Chinese evidence given and examined in his work, *Foreign Notices of South India*, Prof. Sastri assigns a long reign—40 years, to Narasimhavarman II. As for the evidence 'Tso' fou Yuan Kouei', a great Chinese

1. E. C. Vol. IX. Intro. p. 4; E. I. Vol. V. No. 18. p. 161.

encyclopaedia compiled about A. D. 1013, it contains many references to Narasimhavarman II's relations with China.¹ According to the first reference the Pallava king proposed in A. D. 720 to the Chinese emperor to place his war elephants and cavalry at his disposal for chastising the Arabs and Tibetans and asked him to give a name to his army, and the emperor named it "the army which cherished virtue"² It is surprising that Narasimhavarman II should have proposed to the Chinese emperor to extend his military assistance against the Arabs and Tibetans for they were not, as Prof. Sastri himself says, the enemies of any South Indian state either in the 7th century A. D. or in the next century. Prof. Sastri draws a very different inference from this datum. He surmises that the Chinese court was anxious to enlist Narasimhavarman II's support in its plans against Tibetans.³ But it may be said that in the light of persistent hostility between the Pallavas and W. Chālukyas Narasimhavarman II would not have proposed to extend any military aid to the Chinese emperor. Prof. R. C. Majumdar is of opinion that the embassy of Yaśovarman of Kanauj and of Lalitāditya of Kashmir, sent to China in the first half of the 8th century, might have asked for Chinese help against the Arabs and Tibetans.⁴ Since Yaśovarman was at war with the Arabs he might have done so. In that case the Chinese chronicler must have confused in his account the activities at the Chinese court of the several embassies sent from different parts of India. But it must be accepted that there is nothing improbable in the statement that Narasimhavarman II sent

1. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *F. N. S. I.* p. 116.

2. *Ibid.* p. 116.

3. *Ibid.* Intro. p. 17.

4. *The Classical Age.* p. 130.

an embassy to China, though the purpose, date and other details of it are not known for certain.

In the second passage¹ we find a reference to the tribute made by the Pallava king to the Chinese emperor. This need not be regarded as an evidence of Pallava subordination to the Chinese. To make presents to the ruler of a country by the envoy or ambassador of another country was very common in those days. Some such presents made by the Pallava embassy to the Chinese emperor must have been mistaken by later Chinese chroniclers as tribute. According to this passage the Pallava embassy was at the Chinese court in A. D. 720.

According to the third passage² the Chinese emperor conferred on the Pallava king the title, 'King of the kingdom of South India'.

Kieon T'ang Chou, another Chinese work, states that Narasimhavarmān II constructed a temple 'on account of the Chinese empire' and addressed the Chinese emperor to give a name to it. The Chinese emperor decided that the name of the temple should be 'which causes return to virtue' – (Koeihoa)³. The temple said to have been built by the Pallava king 'on account of the Chinese empire' must have been a Buddhist one. But no epigraph of Narasimhavarmān II refers to his erection of a Buddhist temple. It is very doubtful whether Narasimhavarmān, one of the most ardent Śaiva kings of the period, would at a time when there was no love lost between the Śaivas and the Buddhists of the Tamil country, have

1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op. cit.* p. 116.

2. *Ibid.* p. 117.

3. *Ibid.* p. 117.

attempted to build a Buddhist temple in his country for the sole purpose of pleasing the ruler of a distant oversea empire from whom he had neither trouble nor assistance of any kind to expect.¹

The testimony of Ma-Twan-lin² which Prof. Sastri regards as confirmatory does not at all confirm the details given above regarding Narasimhavarmā's embassy to China. The account of Ma-Twan-lin does not mention the name of Narasimhavarmā. According to it the Five Indias sent ambassadors to the court of the Chinese emperor and 'an ambassador from Central India proceeded three times as far as the extremity of South India and came only once (to the Chinese court) to offer birds of five colours that could talk'³ It is also said that he applied for aid against the Arabs and Tibetans that he offered to take the command of the auxiliary troops and that he was given the rank of General-in-Chief.⁴

It will be clear from what has been said above that the Chinese writers must have certainly confused the transactions at the Chinese court of the embassies sent from various parts of India. Naturally we cannot rely for fixing the date of the Pallava king on such a defective and late evidence. In fact Prof. Sastri himself points out some of the glaring defects of the Chinese evidences.⁵

1. *Contra* - V. Venkatasubba Ayyar, *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, Intro. p. IV.

2. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op. cit.*, p. 117.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Ibid.* Intro. pp. 16 and 17.

Again Prof. Sastri identifies Narasimhavarman II's embassy to China with the mission of the Buddhist preceptor Vajrabodhi.¹ While Prof. Sastri thinks that Vajrabodhi was a South Indian, Mr. P. C. Bagchi regards him as a North Indian, son of Išānavarman, king of Central India.² But Vajrabodhi's contact with the Pallava king is highly probable. It is not known whether Vajrabodhi was identical with the ambassador sent from Central India to China and referred to in the pages of Ma-Twan-lin. Vajrabodhi's voyage to China appears to have been prolonged. His arrival at Canton in A. D. 720 coupled with the long delay that occurred during his voyage indicates that he must have left the Pallava country some years before A. D. 720.³ If the exact date of his departure from the Pallava country were known, it can enable us to know a little better about the duration of Narasimhavarman II's reign.

Above all we do not possess any lithic or copper-plate record of Narasimhavarman II bearing a higher regnal year than his 12th year. A recently discovered copper-plate inscription of Narasimhavarman II contains some astronomical data which indicate A. D. 711 for his 12th regnal year.⁴ Therefore we cannot accept Prof. Sastri's view that the Pallava king ruled for 40 years till A. D. 720 for according to the record A. D. 720 must be his 21st and not 40th regnal year.

1. *Ibid.* Intro. p. 18.

2. P. C. Bagchi - *India and China* (1950) p. 53. Mr. Bagchi's view is supported by Sylvain Levi - *Vide J. A.* 1900 May-June. pp. 418-421.

3. P. C. Bagchi - *Op. cit.* p. 53; K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op. cit.* Intro. p. 18.

4. A. 56 of 1949-50.

As regards the date of Paramēśvaravarman II. Prof. Sastri assigns to him a period of ten years. This view is probably based on the fact that W. Chālukya Vikramāditya II claims that while Yuvarāja he defeated the Pallava king Paramēśvaravarman.¹ Since Vikramāditya II came to power in A. D. 733-34 the conflict mentioned above must have taken place before that. Paramēśvaravarman referred to in the records of Vikramāditya is generally identified with Paramēśvaravarman II, son of Narasimhavarman II. But we must not forget the fact that Nandivarman II Pallavamalla also had the name Paramēśvaravarman.² But it is not known whether even after his coronation he was called by that name by his enemies. Even after his coronation the Chōla king Kulōttuṅga I was called by his Pre-coronation name, Rājendra.³ Further there is no record of Paramēśvaravarman II bearing his 10th regnal year. Definite evidence therefore of the duration of his rule is not available. With regard to the regnal periods of Nandivarman II and his successors Prof. Sastri proceeds on the basis mentioned above. But in the case of Nandivarman III and his successors the learned historian lends his support to the theory of overlapping regnal periods. Thus, for instance, Nṛipatuṅga is said to have been made heir-apparent or Yuvarāja in A. D. 855 though his father continued to rule till A. D. 860. As to the long reign of Nṛipatuṅga, 41 years according to the recently discovered Maṭhavalam (Chittoor district) stone inscription⁴ we shall discuss it at some length in due course.

-
1. *A. I.* 1946-47, No. 5, p. 54.
 2. *S. I. I.* Vol. IV, No. 135, p. 11, Section C.
 3. See *S. I. I.* Vol. VIII, Nos. 392 and 807.
 4. *A. I.* 1946-47, No. 5, p. 54.

Dr. D. C. Sircar who concurs in Prof. Sastri's dates of Pallava kings from Narasimhavarmaṇ II to Nandivarmaṇ II differs from him in regard to the duration of the reigns of the successors of Dantivarmaṇ. Prof. Sastri thinks that the rule of Dantivarmaṇ came to an end in A. D. 845, but Dr. Sircar holds that it continued for two more years.¹ Again Prof. Sastri assigns to Nandivarmaṇ III a reign-period of 22 years from A. D. 844 while Dr. Sircar identifying Nandivarmaṇ III with Kampavarmaṇ gives him a reign-period of 25 years from A. D. 847.²

There is no basis for identifying Nandivarmaṇ III, with Kampavarmaṇ. Nandikampa means only Kampa, son of Nandi or Nandivarmaṇ. The practice of prefixing part of father's name to the name of the ruling king was in use in the 9th century. As for example Nandivarmaṇ III was also known as Danti-Nandivarmaṇ³ Further the numerous lithic records of Kampavarmaṇ, some of them dated in his 26th and 32nd regnal years⁴ do not mention the well-known surname of Nandivarmaṇ III viz. Tejjāreraṇḍa which we find in almost all his records dated after his 10th year. Nor do we find the name of Kampa in any of the inscriptions of Nandivarmaṇ III. Obviously Dr. Sircar's view is untenable⁵ and the latest known regnal year of Nandivarmaṇ III is 22⁶

1. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*. p. 167.

2. *Ibid.* pp. 165 and 166.

3. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 48, p. 20, LL 2&3.

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, Nos. 110 and 111.

5. See also paragraph 9 of *M. E. R.* 1912 and *E. I.* Vol. VII, p. 196.

6. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 57.

With regard to the reign-period of Nṛipatuṅgavarman Prof. Sastri gives the date A. D. 855-896 while Dr. Sircar gives a very different date, A. D. 872-913.¹ Dr. Sircar's view on this date is based on the grounds mentioned above and on others, the Maṭhavalam inscription of Nṛipatuṅga dated in his 41st year², the identification of Piṇḍi Gaṅgarāyar of the two Āmbūr inscriptions of Nṛipatuṅga with Prithivīpati I, and the identification of the Pallava mentioned in the Karandai plates with Nṛipatuṅga³.

As regards the Maṭhavalam lithic record it may be a genuine one but no details other than the date are available. The identification of Piṇḍi Gaṅgarāyar of the Āmbūr inscriptions with Prithivīpati I, though supported by Dr. Hultzsch and V. Venkayya, is untenable as we have seen in connection with the W. Gaṅgas.⁴ As to the Pallava mentioned in the Karandai plates of Rājendra I it must be borne in mind that the name of the Pallava king is not given in that record. If Nṛipatuṅga were identical with the Pallava referred to in the inscription, his name would have been certainly mentioned. But the existence of Pallava princes after Āditya's conquest of Tondaimaṇḍalam is very probable. Āditya I does not claim in any of his records to have extinguished the Pallava family. In case we accept Dr. Sircar's view we must postdate the battle of Srīpuṇḍiyam or assign an unusually long reign - 86 years (A. D. 812-898), to Prithivīpati I. Neither view can be supported in the absence of concrete evidence.

1. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*. p. 167.

2. *A. I.* 1946-47, No. 5, p. 54.

3. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*. p. 166;

J. O. R. Vol. XIX, pp. 148 and 149.

4. See the Chap. on the W. Gaṅgas

The Tiruvadi inscription of Nṛipatuṅga dated in his 18th year mentions the Pāṇḍya king Varaguṇa Mahārāja¹ who is doubtless Varaguṇa II (A.D. 862-880). This record proves that the 18th regnal year of Nṛipatuṅga falls before A. D. 880 when just after the battle of Śrīpuṛambiyam Varaguṇa II's rule came to a close. Thus Nṛipatuṅga did not ascend the Pallava throne in A. D. 872 as Dr. Sircar believes, but much earlier.

The Tiruchcheṇṇampūṇḍi stone inscription of Nṛipatuṅga² contains some astronomical details which point out A. D. 867 for the 22nd regnal year of Nṛipatuṅga³ though according to Mr. M. Somasekhara Sarma a better alternative, A. D. 884, is also possible⁴.

A Bāṇa inscription from Tiruvallam (N. Arcot district) dated in Saka 810 (A. D. 888) mentions no overlord⁵ thus indicating the independence of the Bāṇas. The political condition of South India after the battle of Śrīpuṛambiyam must have facilitated their assertion of independence. Now if Dr. Sircar's date for Nṛipatuṅga is accepted it will be difficult to explain how after declaring their independence in A. D. 888 the Bāṇas again became feudatory to Nṛipatuṅga in (A. D. 872 + 24) A. D. 896 when the Chōḷa king Āditya I had already become master of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam.

Again the date of Āditya I's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam is also a relevant fact in examining the date of Nṛipatuṅga.

-
1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 71; 360 of 1921.
 2. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII, No. 528; 303 of 1901.
 3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. Appendix C.
 4. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII, (1934), pp. 166 and 167.
 5. *S. I. I.* Vol. III, No. 44.

A Chōḷa inscription¹ found at Tirumālpuram (Walajapet taluk, N. Arcot district) refers to a grant made in the 21st and 22nd years of a Chōḷa king called Toṇḍaimāṇār-tuṇḷiṇadēva. This Chōḷa king is rightly identified by V. Venkayya with Āḍitya I and Venkayya's conclusion is supported by Dr. Hultsch.² Toṇḍaimāṇār is identified with Toṇḍaimāṇad near Kālahasti.³ The details and find-place of the record indicate that by A. D. 891 or 892 Āḍitya I must have accomplished at least the major part of his conquest of Toṇḍaimāṇḍalam. Another record of the same Chōḷa king dated in his 24th year⁴ is found at Takkōlam (N. Arcot district). A third inscription of the same Chōḷa king dated in his 27th year is found at Tirukkaḷukkuṇṇam (Chingleput district).⁵ All these records unmistakably point out that before the end of the 9th century Āḍitya I must have established his control over Toṇḍaimāṇḍalam. It is practically certain that before attempting the conquest of Toṇḍaimāṇḍalam Āḍitya I must have brought under his rule the entire Kāvēri region.

Two stone inscriptions of Nṛipatunga dated in his 22nd year are found in the Saḍaiyar temple at Tiruchcheṇṇampūṇḍi⁶ near Kōvilāḍi in the Tanjore district. A third inscription of the same king dated the same year is found at Tirukkōḍikāval in the Kumbakonam taluk.⁷ Another lithic record of the same Pallava dated in his 24th year is

1. 286 of 1906; *S. I. I.* Vol. III, No. 142.

2. *Ibid.* p. 289.

3. *Ibid.* p. 289.

4. *E. I.* Vol. XIX, No. 12.

5. *E. I.* Vol. III, No. 38A, p. 279.

6. 300 and 301 of 1901.

7. 38 of 1930-31.

found at the same place.¹ Now, if the first regnal year of Nṛipatuṅga be A. D. 872 we must believe that in A. D. 896 he was in possession of a part of the Kāvērī delta. We must further believe that before recovering the Chōḷa country proper Āditya I took Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam from Aparājita. Obviously these are untenable contentions. In other words if Dr. Sircar's date for Nṛipatuṅga is accepted it will be difficult to explain the existence of the Pallava king's records in the heart of the Chōḷa country. Nor will it be less difficult to account for the existence of Āditya I's records in the heart of the Pallava empire. It is therefore clear that Nṛipatuṅga's reign must have come to an end before Āditya I's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam.

Further Dr. Sircar presumes that Aparājita and Nṛipatuṅga simultaneously reigned over different parts of the Pallava empire.² But it is very difficult to sustain this view for the find-spots of the records of the two rulers do not make such a suggestion. No doubt Aparājita's inscriptions are not seen in the Chōḷa country proper while those of Nṛipatuṅga exist there. Nevertheless the existence of the records of two kings in some places in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam (e. g. Chittoor and Chingleput districts) precludes the possibility of partition of the Pallava empire in the time of Nṛipatuṅga.

A word about Aparājita's position in Pallava genealogy must be said here. Though the exact relationship of Aparājita to Nṛipatuṅga is not yet known it is practically

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 78; 22 of 1930-31.

2. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj.* p. 166.

certain that he was the successor of the latter. The Udayēṇḍiram plates of Prithivīpati II¹ mention only Aparājita in connection with the battle of Śrīpuṇḍriyam, and are silent on Nṛipatuṅga. Similarly Chōḷa records mentioning Āditya I's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam do not refer to Nṛipatuṅga. On the other hand we have specific reference in the Tiruvāḷaṅgaḍu plates² to the fact that Āditya I conquered Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam from Aparājita. If Nṛipatuṅga were then alive his name would have been certainly mentioned in the record. All these evidences point to the conclusion that Aparājita must have succeeded Nṛipatuṅga some years before the battle of Śrīpuṇḍriyam. There is absolutely no possibility of identifying Aparājita with Nṛipatuṅga³ though the name Aparājita was also a surname of Pallava kings like Nara-simhavarmaṇ II, son of Paramēśvarvarmaṇ I.⁴

The possibility of overlapping reign-periods particularly from the reign of Nandivarmaṇ II cannot be ruled out. But it cannot be supported in the absence of essential details.

The foregoing pages show that there is much uncertainty about the dates of the Pallavas of the 8th and 9th centuries and that the chronological and genealogical schemes of the Pallavas furnished by Mr. R. Gopalan can still be regarded as a good working hypothesis till a satisfactory alternative is available.

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. II, No. 76.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. III, No. 205, v. 49.

3. *Contra* – Gopinatha Rao – *M. C. C. Mag.*
Vol. XXIV, p. 538.

4. 566 of 1912.

CONCLUSION

We shall now attempt to present in brief a connected account of the part played by feudatories in Pallava history. In the 4th century A. D. we find the powerful Bāṇas siding with Mayūraśarmaṇ and making the Pallavas come to terms with him. In the next century the W. Gaṅgas are seen helping the Pallavas in subduing the Bāṇas and in fighting the hostile Kadambas. The subordination of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu was probably of considerable assistance to the consolidation and expansion of the Pallava power in the time of Simhavishṇu. But their subsequent alliance with the W. Chāḷukyas weakened the Pallavas. The Bāṇas following the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷas threw in their lot with the W. Chāḷukyas. The defence of the north-west region of the empire thus became a formidable problem for the Pallavas and the initial triumph of W. Chāḷukya invasions of the Pallava empire in the 7th and 8th centuries was, in a great measure, due to the hostile policy of the two feudatory dynasties.

We have mentioned the possibility of the Chōḷas of the Tamil country assisting Paramēśvaravarmaṇ in his war with W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya I. In his struggle with Chitramāya and the Tamil powers Nandivarmaṇ II was ably supported by his Muttaraiya feudatories. The part played by the Chōḷas in the siege of Nandipura is not clear, though their alliance with the Pāṇḍyas in the initial stage of the siege is quite possible. The Adigamaṇs of the Koṅgu country appear to have played a hostile part in Śrīpuruṣha's invasion of the Pallava empire in the time of Nandivarmaṇ II. The Bāṇas who became again feudatory to Pallavas helped them

against the W. Gaṅgas in the 8th century. In the second half of the 8th century we find the Muttaraiyars wavering in their loyalty to the Pallavas. Their exact role in the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars of this period is not clear. But evidence is not wanting to indicate their temporary subordination to the Pāṇḍyas. It is also clear that they were for a short period independent of the two imperial powers. At the same time the Chōḷas appear to have made common cause with the Pāṇḍyas against the Pallavas. The Adigamaṅṅs assisted in vain the Pallavas in combating the expansion of the Pāṇḍya power under Neḍuṅṇaḍaiyaṅṅ. Naturally the Pallava power was eclipsed for some time in the Chōḷa country in the time of Dantivarmaṅṅ.

The beginning of the 9th century witnessed further troubles to the Pallavas. The Bāṇas changed their allegiance to the Rāshṭrakūṭas. Taking advantage of the internal troubles of Amōghavarsha the W. Gaṅgas invaded the Pallava empire. The accession of Nandivarmaṅṅ III ushered in another period of Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle. The Chōḷas of Paḷaiyārai seem to have played a hostile part in the battle of Teḷḷāru. But at the time of the battle of Kuḍamūkku they figure as the allies of the Pallavas. We do not know what part the Muttaraiyars played in the two wars. Their probable alliance with the Pāṇḍyas during this period must have afforded a good opportunity for Vijayālaya to seize Tanjore. The capture of Tanjore by the Chōḷas was the beginning of the end of Muttaraiya influence in the Kāvērī region. The Bāṇas took an important part in the wars against the Noḷambas and the W. Gaṅgas. Prithivīpati I's alliance with the Bāṇas was helpful to the Pallavas inasmuch as it checked the rapid progress of the hostile Noḷambas and the main branch of the W. Gaṅgas. The rift in the Noḷamba - W. Gaṅga alliance which originated in their defeat at Sōremaṭi

(A. D. 878) enabled the Pallavas to bestow their whole attention on the Pāṇḍyas. Attention has already been drawn to the great services of Pṛithivīpati I to the Pallavas in the battle of Śrīpuṇḍriyam (A.D. 880). The Chōḷas stood by the Pallavas at this time. It was the support of the feudatories that was largely responsible for the victory of the Pallavas at Śrīpuṇḍriyam.

The rise of the Chōḷas after this war was very striking. Neither the Pāṇḍyas nor the Muttaraiyars were in a position to check it. The Chōḷas seem to have brought the Koḍum-bāḷūr chiefs and the Muttaraiyars under their control and succeeded in befriending the successors of Pṛithivīpati I. The Bāṇas became independent by A. D. 888. The growing weakness of the imperial authority is clear from the existence in a limited area of the inscriptions of Aparājita. As noted above, the immediate cause of Āditya I's conflict with his overlord is not known. But the natural tendency of a rising feudatory power to overthrow its declining paramount power may, to some extent, account for this conflict. Instances of this kind have already been cited. The downfall of the Pallavas was mainly, but not solely, due to their loss of the support of feudatories. The long struggle of the Pallavas against the W. Chāḷukyas and the Pāṇḍyas greatly exhausted them and left them at the mercy of their powerful vassals.

We have noted in detail the cultural services rendered by the feudatories. The growth of the Bhakti cult was the driving force in their cultural activities. Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism made remarkable progress under the patronage of the feudatories. Jainism and Buddhism began to decline on account of the tremendous endeavours of the Nayanmāras and the Āḷvars. Attention has already been drawn to the notable contribution to Tamil literature of the Jain scholars under

the Muttaraiyars. In an age of great religious upheaval the Pallava feudatories exhibited not only tolerance but also liberality. Men of learning were patronised irrespective of their persuasions. Architecture and sculpture made great advance under the feudatories. It is interesting to note that the cave-architecture persisted much longer in the Muttaraiya region than in other parts of the Pallava empire. The high degree of Sanskrit learning that we find in Gaṅgavāḍi in the 5th century deserves special mention.

Now, the question may be raised whether on the whole the Pallava feudatories were unhelpful or helpful to the stability and progress of the Pallava empire. The answer is that they were both. The task of successfully governing a wide empire depended in those days largely on the loyalty of the local or subordinate powers. The Pallava empire was no exception. The Pallava feudatories had their own armies and were in possession of strategically important territories, and as such were able to influence the vicissitudes of the imperial dynasty. Like the other feudatories of their times, they generally acknowledged the supremacy of their powerful neighbour or the victorious enemy and rarely stood by their weak or vanquished masters. Thus when the Pāṇḍya king Neḍuṇjaḍaiyaṇ alias Parāntakaṇ took the Kāvērī region from the Pallavas, the Muttaraiyars changed their allegiance to him. In times of civil war as in the reign of Nandivarmaṇ II, the feudatories ranged themselves on either side and contributed to the instability of the imperial power. If the imperial power was at any time weak, or if it began to decline, the feudatories either declared their independence as the Muttaraiyars and the Bāṇas did in the 9th century, or tried to establish their own power by overthrowing the imperial power as the Chōḷa king Āditya I did.

But the reverse of the medal cannot be overlooked. We have already noted in detail the valuable military assistance rendered by the feudatories to the Pallavas. Nandivarman II owed much to Udayachandra and to Perumbidugu Muttaraiyan II for the stability of his rule. The support of the Bāṇas was very helpful to the Pallavas in the frontier wars and enabled them to check the incursions of the Pāṇḍyas. The part played by Pṛithivīpati I in the battle of Śrīpurāmbiyam was a remarkable one. Lastly the cultural activities of the feudatories noted in previous chapters testify to their share in the cultural progress of the Pallava empire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1 Ancient India.
- 2 Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy
- 3 Archaeological Survey of India
- 4 Archaeological Survey of Mysore
- 5 *Arokiaswamy, M.*, (1) The History of the Veḷḷār Basin, 1954 (2) The Koṅgu Country, 1956
- 6 *Bagchi, P. C.*, India and China, 1950
- 7 *Balasubramanyan, S. R.*, Sendalai, 1952
- 8 *Bhavanandam pillai, S.*, (Ed.) Yāpparuṅgalam, 1916
- 9 Bombay Gazetteer. Vol. I., part II.
- 10 Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
- 11 Chronological List of the Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State
- 12 Dr. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar Commemoration Volume 1936
- 13 *Duraisami pillai, Avvai. S.*, (Ed.) Puṇānūṟu, 1952
- 14 Epigraphia Indica
- 15 Epigraphia Carnatica
- 16 *Gopalan. R.*, History of the Pallavas of Kanchi, 1928
- 17 *Gopalaier, A.*, (Ed.) Nandikkalāmbakam, 1927
- 18 *Hayavadana Rao, C.*, (Ed.) Mysore Gazetteer
- 19 Indian Antiquary
- 20 Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State (Texts)
- 21 Journal Asiatique
- 22 Journal of the Annamalai University
- 23 Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society

- 24 Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
- 25 Journal of Indian History
- 26 Journal of the Madras University
- 27 Journal of Oriental Research
- 28 Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
- 29 *Karmeka Kavignar*, (Ed.) Koṅgumaṇḍalaśatakam, 1923.
- 30 *Krishnamacharyar, K.* (Ed.)
Guruparambarārabāvam. 1927.
- 31 *Krishna Rao, M. V.*, The Gaṅgas of Talkad, 1936.
- 32 Madras Christian College Magazine.
- 33 *Majumdar, R. C.*,
(Ed.) 1. The Classical Age, 1954.
(Ed.) 2. The Age of Imperial Kanauj, 1956.
- 34 *Mayilai Ilamuruganar* (Ed.) – Devāram. 1953.
- 35 *Mayilai Madhavadasan* (Ed.)
Nālāyiradivyaṇḍam. 1950.
- 36 *Minakshi, C.*, Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas, 1938.
- 37 Nellore District Inscriptions.
- 38 New Indian Antiquary,
- 39 *Nilakanta Sastri K. A.*,
1) The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 1929.
2) The Cōḷas (Second Edition), 1955.
3) History of South India, 1955.
4) Foreign Notices of South India, 1939.
- 40 Periyapurāṇam – Saiva Siddhanta Maha Śamajam Edition, 1950.
- 41 *Pope, G. U.*, The Nālāḍiyār (English Translation), 1893
- 42 Proceedings of the Indian History Congress
- 43 Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society

- 44 *Raghavaiyengar, M.*, Āḷvarkaḷ Kālanilai, 1931
Śaṣaṇat-Tamiḷ Kavi Charitam, 1937.
- 45 *Rajamanikkam M.*, 1) Pallavar Varalāṟu, 1944.
2) Periyapurāṇa Ārāichchi, 1948.
- 46 *Ramachandran Chettiar, C. M.* (Ed.) Koṅgudēśa-
rājakkal 1950.
- 47 *Ramaswami Aiyangar M. S.*, Studies in South Indian
Jainism, 1922.
- 48 *Robert Sewell*,
1) List of Antiquarian Remains in the Madras
Presidency, 1882.
2) Historical Inscriptions of South India (Ed. by
Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar). 1932.
- 49 *Sadasiva Pandarathar, T. V.*,
1) Pāṇḍyar Varalāṟu, 1952.
2) Pirkāla Chōḷar Charittiram, Vol. I, 1949.
3) Tamil Ilakkiya Varalāṟu (200-600 A. D.), 1955.
- 50 Sentamiḷ Vols.
- 51 *Sethu Pillai, R. P.* Tamiḷakam - Ūrum Pērum, 1946.
- 52 South Indian Inscriptions Vols. 1-13.
- 53 South Indian Temple Inscriptions. Vol. I.
- 54 *Srinivasa Pillai, K.*, Tamil Varalāṟu, Vol. I, part II,
1949.
- 55 *Subramanya Aiyar, K. V.*, Historical Sketches of
Ancient Dekkan, 1917.
- 56 Tamil Poḷil Vols.
- 57 Travancore Archaeological Series.
- 58 *Thomas Watters* - On Yuan Chwang's Travels in
India, Vol. II, 1905.
- 59 T. T. etc. Devasthanam Inscriptions (Texts and
Translations) Vol. I.

- 60 *Venkatarama Ayyar K. R.*, (Ed.)
A Manual of the Pudukkottai State (Revised
Edition); Vols. I & II, 1944
- 61 *Venkatasami, Mayilai Seeni*, Samanamum Tamilum.
1954
- 62 *Venkatasami Nattar, N. M.*, (Ed.) Aganāṇṇu, 1946

Index

- Āchāryar Aniruddar, 60, 61.
 Adhirājamaṅgalam, 71, 74, 80.
 Adigamaṇṣ, 112-124; their relations with the Paṇḍyas and W. Gaṅgas, 112-121; Jainism, 121 and 122; Vaishṇavism, 122 and 123; Saivism, 123 and 124; architecture and sculpture, 124.
 Āditya I, Chōḷa, 48, 82, 92, 131, 149, 160-164, 167-168.
 Adiyaṅkuppam, 120.
 Adiyaṅūr, 120.
 Aijaṇḍi, 28.
 Akaṇḍattuvāriyar, 15.
 Ālappākka-Vijayanallūḷaṅ, 143.
 Amarnidi alias Pallavadiya-raiyar, 149.
 Amarūṇṇilai, 60 and 61.
 Āmbūr, 130, 131.
 Amōghavarsha, 11, 12, 16, 166.
 Amritasākaraṇār, 61.
 Aparājita, Pallava, 91, 131, 135, 146, 148, 163, 164, 167.
 Aparājitaṅ Kulamaṇikkaṅ Mahādevaṅ, 148.
 Arikesarivarmaṅ, 78.
 Ativira Anupamā, 71.
 Avaṇichandra, 142-144.
 Avāṇita, W. Gaṅga, 3, 33, 128.
 Bāṇas, 1-37; their role in Pallava history, 1-24; their feudatory status, 25; their administration, 25; their military tradition, 25, 26; their constructive work, 27; their patronage of Jainism, 27, 28; Saivism, 29, 30, 31; architecture and sculpture, 31, 32; their habitat 33-37.
 Bhavaṇandi, 28.
 Bhōgaṇandi, temple, 31-32.
 Bhūti Vikramakēśari, 71-73, 75-77, 79, 80.
 Bōdhiṁgaḷ, 97.
 Buddhadatta, 101.
 Buddhasatva, 136.
 Būdi-dhīraṅ, 147.
 Chālukyas, W., 4.
 Chēdi-nāḍu, 139, 140.
 Chippili, 13, 100.
 Chitramāya, 39, 140.
 Chōḷas, of Uṇaiyūr and Paḷaiyārai. 83-98; their role in Pallava-Chālukya and Pallava-Paṇḍya wars, 84-92; conquest of Tonḍaimaṇḍalam, 92; Saivism, 93-95; Vaishṇavism, 95-96; Jainism, 96-98.
 Chōḷas, of Rēṇāṇḍu, 99-111; their country 99-100; their origin, 100-101; their role

- in Pallava history, 101-109; Jainism, 109-110; Buddhism 110, Śaivism & Vaishnavism, 110-111; Patronage of learning, 111.
- Dantivarman, 12, 44, 45, 50, 52, 57, 88, 159.
- Dēvāram*, 30, 93, 139.
- Dēvasēna, 28.
- Dhāṇāñjayavarman, Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa, 102.
- Dharmapuri, 112, 122, 124.
- Dharmavarman Chōḷa, 96.
- Diṇḍi, 16.
- Divākara, Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa, 13.
- Dommarā-Nandyāla, Plates, 104, 111.
- Durvinīta, W. Gaṅga, 3, 113, 128.
- Eṇṇiyiyāḍigal, title, 4.
- Gaṅgadiyaraiyar, 132.
- Gaṅgadiyaraiyar Kaṇṇāḍu Peruṅgaṅgar, 8, 132.
- Gaṅgas, W., 125-138; their relations with the Pallavas, 125-135; Culture, 135; Buddhism, 136, Jainism, 137; Śaivism & Vaishnavism, 137-138.
- Gaṅga Six-thousand, 8, 9, 12, 15, 17.
- Gaṅgavāḍi, 11, 12, 136, 137.
- Govinda III, 9, 10, 29, 31, 129, 130, 152, 153.
- Guṇamudita, Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa, 104.
- Guruparambarāprabāvam* 95, 96, 97.
- Harivarman, W. Gaṅga, 35, 125, 137.
- Helāchārya, 28.
- Hiuen Tsang, 99, 109, 110.
- Iḷamperumāṇār, 60, 61.
- Ilaṅgō-Adhiyaraiyaṇ alias Vikrama Bhūti, 81.
- Ilaṅgō Muttaraiyar, 45, 46, 56.
- Ilaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṇ alias Māraṇ Paramēśvaraṇ, 39, 65.
- Indaḷūr-naḍu, 149.
- Indapparāsa, 10, 11.
- Indranandi Yōgindra, 28.
- Iṇṇambar-naḍu, 148.
- Iriga, 16.
- Īśvaradāsa, 10, 29.
- Jayamēru, 14.
- Jayanandivarman, Bāṇa, 6-9.
- Jayateja, 10, 29.
- Kaḍuṅgōṇ. Pāṇḍya, 69.
- Kaḍuvetti, 9, 23.
- Kaḍuvetti Muttaraiyaṇ, 57, 60.
- Kakusthavarman, Kadamba, 1, 35.
- Kaḷabhras, 68, 69, 70, 100.
- Kālaśakti, 29.
- Kanauj, 154.
- Karikāla, 100.
- Kaśakkudi, Plates, 3.
- Kashmir, 154.
- Kāviriṇṇampattinam, 100.
- Kieon T'ang Chou*, 155.
- Kirtivarman II, W. Chāḷukya 6, 36.
- Kōchchaḍaiyaṇ, Pāṇḍya, 86.
- Kōcheṅgaṇāṇ, 75-77.
- Koḍumbāḷūr, chiefs, 71-82; Ins., 71-80; town 40, 70, 76, 80.
- Koḍumuḍi, 123.

- Koṇḍa-nāḍu, 146.
 Koṅgaṇivarman, W. Gaṅga, 2, 33, 124.
Koṅgumaṇḍalaśatakam, 122.
 Ko-Vijaya-kampavarman, Pallava, 15, 81, 131, 133, 149, 159.
 Ko-Vijaya-Narasimha-varman, 134.
 Ko-Vijaya-Śkandasishya, 120.
 Kōyārūr, 17.
Kōyiloluhu, 102.
 Kūdlūr, Plates, 2.
 Kuḷidikki, 8.
 Kumārandai Kurumbarā-dittan alias Kādupattipēraiyan, 147, 148.
 Kumarāṅkuśa, 89.
 Kundavai, 17, 30.
 Kuṇṇāṇḍārkovil, 44, 58, 66.
Lōkavibhāga, 3, 28, 35, 126.
 Mādhava I, W. Gaṅga, 125.
 Mādhava III, -do-, 127, 136, 137.
 Mādhavavarman, -do-, 2.
 Madras Museum Plates, 116, 117, 119.
 Mahēndra Nōḷamba, 17, 18, 20, 21, 121.
 Mahēndravarmān I, Pallava, 54, 57, 68, 69, 74, 104, 105, 114, 139.
 Mahēndravarmān, Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa, 103, 104.
 Mahēndravikrama, Telugu Chōḷa, 18, 22.
 Maḷavas, 114.
 Mālaiyaḍipatti, 45, 59.
 Mālepāḷu, Plates, 104-105, 111.
 Malladēva, Bāṇa, 13, 14.
 Mallan Viḍuman alias Tennavan Tamiḷadiyaraiyan, 55, 82.
 Mallikārjuna, 72.
 Māṇḍāvu, 18.
 Maṅgala-nāḍu, 143, 144.
 Māṇikkabbe, 10, 29.
 Maṇimaṅgala, 74.
 Maṇṇaikūḍi Maramaḍakki Viḷupperaraiyar, 145.
 Māraṇḷaḍaiyan, Paṇḍya, 45, 56.
 Mārasimha II, W. Gaṅga, 131.
 Mārppidūgeri, 51.
 Mārppidugu Ilāṅgōvēḷar alias Sāttan, 80.
 Mārppidugu alias Pēraḍiaraiyan, 44.
 Mārppidugu Peruṅgiṇaṟu, 50.
 Ma-Twan-lin, 156.
 Mayūraśarman, Kadamba, 1, 2, 34, 125, 165.
 Meypporuḷ Nāyaṇār, 140.
 Minuki, battle of, 16.
 Mṛiduva, Nōḷamba general, 23.
 Mudumaḍuvu, 18.
 Muṇaiyarkōṇiḷavaraiyan, 145.
 Muṇaiyaraiyars, 139.
 Murggepaḍi, battle of, 14, 15.
 Muttaraiyars, 38-70, their role in Pallava history, 38-49; feudatory status, 49-50, Constructive work, 50-51; Jainism, 52-54; Śaivism, 55-59; Vaiśṇavism, 59-60; Patronage of Tamil literature 60-63; Contribution to architecture and sculpture, 63-67; their origin, 68-70.

Mutturāju, 70.

Nāgadanta, 16.

Nāḷaḍiyār, 52, 62.

Nālāyiraprabandham, 95,
123.

Namakkal, 114, 117, 122,
123, 124.

Nandachōḷa, 102.

Nandigrāma, 40.

Nandikkalambakam, 89,
90.

Nandi, Plates, 10, 11, 29,
31.

Nandipura, 86, 87, 140.

Nandivarman III, Pallava, 6,
30, 46, 47, 65, 80, 88, 130,
159.

Nandivarman II, Pallava-
malla, 3, 7, 8, 29, 40, 70,
83, 86, 96, 117, 132, 142,
150-153, 158, 165, 168.

Nandivarman,
Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa, 101-102.

Narasimha Bānarāja, 5.

Narsimhavarman I, Pallava,
74, 79, 85.

Narasimhavarman II, -do-,
139, 153-158.

Narasiṅga Munaiyar, 139.

Nārttāmalai, 39, 48, 53, 55,
58, 63.

Nēḍuñjaḍaiyaṅ alias
Parāntaka, Pāṇḍya, 43, 44,
119, 120, 166, 168.

Nitimārga I, W. Gaṅga, 12.

Niyamam, 38, 46, 55, 56.

Noḷambas, 14-18, 23, 121.

Noḷambaḷge, 14.

Nṛipatuṅgavarman, 17, 47,
48, 58, 59, 65, 90, 91, 146,
160-164.

Nṛpakēsari, 71.

Paitāṅgi Kandaṅ, 148.

Paḷaiyārai, 83, 84, 94, 96,
98.

Pānarāshṭra, 3, 28, 35,
126.

Paṅgaḷa-nāḍu, 144.

Paradurgamardana, 71,
74, 75.

Paramēśvaravarman I,
Pallava, 79.

Paramēśvaravarman II, -do-
Pallava, 158.

Paruvi vishaya, 34, 35,
125, 126.

Pāṭalika, 3, 35, 126.

Pāṭaliputtiram, 28, 35.

Pennāgaḍam, 43.

Penukoṇḍa. Plates, 2, 126,
137.

Periyapurāṇam, 28, 84, 94-
97, 112, 140.

Permāvi, 23.

Perumbāṇappādi, 8, 25, 37.

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṅ
alias Kuvāvaṅ Māraṅ, 38,
66.

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṅ II
alias Suvaraṅ Māraṅ, 39-
43, 46, 55, 60-63, 65.

Pirudi Gaṅgaraiyar, 18, 131,
133.

Poḷal Chōra, 14, 17.

Pōrmukharama, title, 5, 108.

Pravirajit, 71.

Prithivīpati I, 11, 16, 17, 19,
20, 130, 131, 135, 160, 166,
167, 169.

Prithivīpati II, 2, 16, 131.

Prithivivyāgra, Nishāda
chief, 140-142.

Pūdikāḷari alias Amarūṇri
Muttaraiyaṅ, 65.

Pugaḷ Chōḷa, 112.

- Pulikeśin II, 4, 35, 74, 84,
 100, 128.
 Puli-nāḍu, 17.
 Puṇyakumāra, Rēnāṇḍu,
 Chōḷa, 104-108.
 Rājāditya, Gaṅga, 133, 138.
 Rājamalla I, W. Gaṅga, 12,
 16, 17.
 Rājamalla II, -do-, 17-19,
 20, 22.
 Rājasimha I, Pāṇḍya, 39, 86.
 Rānavikramaṇ, title, 4.
 Ratnāvai, 10, 29, 31.
 Saḍaiyarmāraṇ, 41.
 Samarābhirāma, 71, 73-75,
 77, 79.
 Sāmbandar, St., 93.
 Saṅghakṛt, 71.
 Sarvanandi, 28.
 Sātavāhanas, 1.
 Satrubhayaṅkara
 Muttaraiyaṇ, 41.
 Sattandai Suttamallaṇ alias
 Aṇuttirapallavaraiyaṇ,
 148.
 Sattaṇ Paḷiyili, 47, 48, 58, 65.
 Sattaṇpūdi, 39, 55, 63.
 Selvaṇvāṇaraiyaṇ, 132.
 Sendalai, 38, 56, 60.
 Sendalai, inss., 40, 46, 69.
 Simhasūri, 28.
 Simhavarmaṇ, 28, 35, 125,
 126.
 Simhavishṇu, Pallava, 3, 68,
 70, 83, 114, 128.
 Simhavishṇu, Rānāṇḍu
 Chōḷa, 102.
 Siruttoṇḍar, St., 93.
 Sittaṇṇavaśal, 54.
 Sivamāra II, W. Gaṅga, 129,
 130.
 Śīyakaṇ, 132.
 Skandasēna, 139.
 Skandavarmaṇ III, 127.
 Sōremaṭi, battle of, 18-22,
 134.
 Śrīmāra Śrīvallabha, 45, 47,
 90.
 Śripārama, 10, 29.
 Śripuraṁbiyam, battle of,
 131, 132, 160.
 Śripurusha, W. Gaṅga, 6, 7,
 36, 118, 119, 129, 165.
 Śripurushamaṅgalam, 7, 119.
 Śrisailam, 1.
 Sundara Chōḷa, 79.
 Sundarar, St., 139.
 Tālaguṇḍa, Plates, 1.
 Tamīlmuttaraiyarkōvai, 61.
 Tellāru, battle of, 88, 89,
 166.
 Tirukkāṭṭupaḷḷi, 38, 53.
 Tirumaṅgai Ālvār, 60, 64,
 95, 96.
 Tirumayyam, 54, 59.
 Tirumuṇaiṇṇāḍu, 139.
 Tiruppan Ālvār, 95, 96.
 Tso'fou Yuan Kouei, 153.
 Turamāra vishaya, 5.
 Udayachandra, 40, 87, 140-
 142, 145.
 Udayaṇa, Sabara King, 140,
 141.
 Udayēndiram, Plates, 2, 16,
 33, 131, 140.
 Ulakapperumāṇār, 96.
 Umbaḷa-nāḍu, 146.
 Vādimadagajendra, 136.
 Vāḍugavaḷi-mērku, 6, 8, 36.
 Vāḍugavaḷi Twelve-thousand
 6, 15, 25, 36.

- Vaidumbas, 13, 18, 21, 22.
 Vaimbalguri, battle of, 16.
 Vajrabodhi, 157.
 Vaḷḷimalai, 28.
 Vāṇapuram, 9.
 Vaṅganūr vishaya, 5.
 Varaguṇa II, Pāṇḍya, 91, 161.
 Vasantipōri, 106.
 Vātāpi, 71.
 Vēṇamban, 60, 61.
 Vēṇikkudī, grant, 39, 40.
 Vettuvadiyaraiyar, 146.
 Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ
 alias Kuvavaṇ Sāttan, 44, 56, 64.
 Viḍelviḍugu Pallavaraiyar, 146.
 Viḍelviḍugu Viḷuppēradi
 Araisaṇ alias Sāttan-
 Māraṇ, 43, 59, 63.
 Vidyādhararāja, 10, 11, 14.
 Vidyāśī, 72, 78.
 Vijayāditya I, Bāṇa, 9 – 13.
 Vijayāditya II, 23, 30.
 Vijayāditya, Rēnāṇḍu
 Chōḷa, 6.
 Vijayāditya III, E. Chāḷukya, 12, 22.
 Vijayālaya, Chōḷa, 47, 48, 55, 83, 90, 94, 166.
 Vijayanallāḷaṇ kāḷavadi-
 yaraiyaṇ, 147.
 Vikramāditya I, Bāṇa, 14–23
 his relations with the
 Nolambas and W. Gaṅgas
 14–17, 21; independence
 23, 30.
 Vikramāditya Bali Indra
 Bāṇarāja, 5.
 Vikramāditya I, W. Chāḷukya
 5, 85, 165.
 Vikramāditya II, W. Chāḷukya
 40, 152, 158.
 Vikrama Bhūti, 81.
 Vinayavinichaya, 101.
 Viṇṇakōvaraiyar, 144.
 Virachūḷāmaṇi, 23.
 Viradēva, 137.
 Virapāṇḍya, 77, 78.
 Viratuṅga, 71.
 Viṣṇugōpa, W. Gaṅga, 126, 127, 138.
 Viṣṇuvardhana III,
 E. Chāḷukya, 142.
 Vṛishabha, 109–110.
 Yāpparuṅgalam, 61, 96.
 Yaśovarman, 154.

Errata

<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>For</i>	<i>Read</i>
4	16	Eṛeyitiadgaḷ	Eṛeyitiyaḍigaḷ
28	4	Saravanandi	Sarvanandi
40	26	Muttaraya	Muttaraiya
40	29	certainty	certainty
42	21	Vēḷ-māraṇ	Vēḷ-Māraṇ
44	15	Āḍigamāṇ	Adigamāṇ
54	20	Pāṇḍayas	Pāṇḍyas
55	4	Nārttāmali	Nārttāmali
56	last line	Īśvarttu	Īśvarattu
62	9	worth-considering	worth considering
68	12	Muttariyars	Muttaraiyars
70	2	Koṛṛamaṅgalam	Koṛṛaṅguḍi
75	f.n.	Edwards's	Edwardes's
77	22	gave	give
104	16	to.....
109	f.n.	Thomas Waters	Thomas Watters
110	f.n.	Thomas Waters	Thomas Watters
116	4	indicates	indicate
130	7	ot	of
130	heading	Prithivīpati II	Prithivīpati I
135	3	power	powers
149	8	Aprajita	Aparājita
158	24	A. D. 860	A. D. 866

